

P

VOL. LXXXI, 2

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

WHOLE No. 322
AUG 12 1960

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

AMERICAN
=

JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by
HENRY T. ROWELL

LUDWIG EDELSTEIN, JAMES H. OLIVER
JAMES W. POULTNEY, JOHN H. YOUNG
EVELYN H. CLIFT: Secretary

Honorary Editors
KEMP MALONE
BENJAMIN D. MERITT

APRIL, 1960

BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND
THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Athena's Development in Homeric Epic. By M. W. M. POPE, -	113
Cicero on the <i>Comitia Centuriata: De Re Publica</i> , II, 22, 39-40. By G. V. SUMNER, - - - - -	136
Financial Transactions of Aurelia Titoueis. By JOHN DAY and SARAH B. FORGES, - - - - -	157
The Place of Codex Vat. Gr. 1823 in the Cebes Manuscript Tradition. By CHAUNCEY E. FINCH, - - - - -	176
Two Terminological Novelties. By NAPHTALI LEWIS, - - - - -	186
REVIEWS: - - - - -	189
<p><i>Gordon and Gordon's Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions. I: Rome and the Neighborhood, Augustus to Nerva (REVILO P. OLIVER).—Gordon and Gordon's Contributions to the Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions (REVILO P. OLIVER).—Brellich's Gli eroi greci. Un problema storico-religioso (FRANCIS R. WALTON).—Badian's Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B. C.) (JOHN V. A. FINE).—Neuhauser's Patronus und Orator: Eine Geschichte der Begriffe von ihren Anfängen bis in die augusteische Zeit (MASON HAMMOND).—Pulgram's The Tongues of Italy (JAMES W. POULTNEY).—Chadwick's The Decipherment of Linear B (WERNER WINTER).—Lévéque's Pyrrhos (T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON).—Neumann's Die poetische Gerechtigkeit in der neuen Komödie: Untersuchungen zur Technik des antiken Lustspiels (PHILIP WHALEY HARSH).—Haywood's The Myth of Rome's Fall (E. T. SALMON).—Seel's Die Praefatio des Pompeius Trogus (J. W. SWAIN).—Forni's Valore storico e fonti di Pompeo Trogus, I: Per le guerre greco-persiane (J. W. SWAIN).—Nybakken's Greek and Latin in Scientific Terminology (JAMES W. POULTNEY).—Edmonds' The Fragments of Attic Comedy, after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock. Augmented, Newly Edited with their Contexts, and Completely Translated into English Verse. Volume II (CHARLES T. MURPHY).—André's Notes de lexicographie botanique grecque (ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE).</i></p>	
BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	224

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$6.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 50 cents, Canadian postage 25 cents, extra); single numbers, \$2.00 each.

Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Henry T. Rowell, The Johns Hopkins University; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore 18, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXXXI, 2

WHOLE NO. 322

ATHENA'S DEVELOPMENT IN HOMERIC EPIC.

There are three stories of the birth of Athena preserved in the *Theogony*.

- (a) She was sprung directly from the head of Zeus; her office is war and she delights in it (924-6).
- (b) She was sprung from the head of Zeus, but only after he had eaten her proper mother *Metis*; if the last four lines properly belong to the passage, she came forth with the weapons of war about her (Chrysippus *ap.* Galen, III, 8, 318, printed in the Teubner text at 886, and in the Loeb at 929).
- (c) She came from the head of Zeus after he had eaten her mother *Metis*, and is stated to be equal to her father in μένος and in βουλή (886-96).

There can be no doubt that the chronological order of these versions is as I have listed them.¹ The provision of an allegorical mother must be subsequent to the simple story: and the trend of the second version is continued in the last, where the emphasis has shifted further from war to wisdom.

In Homeric epic Athena's character undergoes the same development. The *Iliad* knows her mainly as a warrior goddess: in the *Odyssey* she is predominantly a person of ideas, and the bond of sympathy between her and Odysseus is explicitly stated to be their common intelligence. The Homeric hymn in her honour (XXVIII) is later and therefore outside the scope of this

¹ The general view (Solmsen, Jacoby, Wilamowitz, Bergk, and others) is that the passages involving *Metis* are subsequent to the original *Theogony*.

article, but it is worth noticing that though it emphasises her more dramatic and pictorial warrior-like qualities it contains the only verse we have in the Homeric tradition to describe her as *πολύμητις*—an epithet which was almost certainly coined specifically to describe Odysseus.

The problem is an obvious one. At what date and by what process did a Warrior Goddess undergo the apparently unlikely transformation into a goddess associated with wisdom?

First, however, it is necessary to point out that this is the transformation which did in fact take place. The Stoic opinion which interpreted Athena's birth from the head of Zeus as signifying that from the beginning she was connected with intellect, is refuted by the long since observed fact that in Homer the head is not the seat of cogitation. Nevertheless the belief still persists in quarters where it should not,² and it is therefore worth drawing attention to the correct explanation of the myth which has only been put forward comparatively recently.³ Athena was born from Zeus' head (as Dionysus from his thigh) for the reason that according to bronze-age thought on the matter this part of the body contained the greatest quantity of the stuff of procreation. This stuff is the brain or the marrow. For is it not an easily observed fact that the greatest quantities of hair grow out of the parts of the body where there is the greatest concentration of grey matter? And there can be no question of the association between sex and hair. The emergence of Athena from the head is to be thus explained and can be seen to have no intellectual reference at all.

A more plausible alternative is to argue that Athena derived her reputation for general wisdom from her particular technical skills. In origin Athena had a dual function. She was a goddess of war; she was also a goddess of fertility and agriculture. In this domestic aspect she developed as patroness of many arts and crafts. Later, by a process of generalisation from her abilities in this respect, she came to be regarded as associated with wisdom in the broader conduct of life. "She passed from one sense of *σοφία* to the other."⁴ Now it is true that this aspect of

² E.g. Seltman, *The Twelve Olympians*, refers several times to her birth from the "brain" or "mind" of Zeus.

³ R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*, etc., III, p. 233.

⁴ H. J. Rose in *O. C. D.*, s. v. Athena.

Athena is ancient,⁵ and that it was known to both the Homeric and the Hesiodic traditions. But it does not seem—at any rate as far as the minstrels were concerned—as if her reputation for wisdom was in any way derived from it. The only reason to suppose that the Greeks failed to distinguish such evidently disparate qualities as political wisdom and technical skill is the equivocal meaning of the word σοφία. But “skilfulness” is always the implication of the word in the earliest instances we have of its usage. It is not till the sixth century, till, that is to say, the Homeric and Hesiodic poets had long since associated Athena with μῆτις and βουλή, that we find it used in a generalised sense. And contemporaneously with the earliest occurrences of σοφός meaning “wise,” we find it also used in *malam partem* to imply “clever” and therefore dishonest. The word would not therefore have provided a very good *exemplar* for Athena to have followed. But the case does not rest on this somewhat negative and *a priori* evidence. The words which are employed in Homer and Hesiod in connection with Athena’s wisdom are μῆτις and βουλή.⁶ Neither of these implies technical skill. Moreover in the Homeric speech where Athena is most explicit about her wisdom (ν 298-9):

ἐγὼ δ’ ἐν πᾶσι θεοῖσι
μήτι τε κλέομαι καὶ κέρδεσι

there is no mention at all of her connection with domestic arts. She speaks purely as a strategist. It is clear that as far as both epic traditions are concerned it is the Warrior Maid who developed brains, and not the Fertility Goddess.

I can now come to the process of the development. The first necessity of course is to establish the chronological framework

⁵ The name Athena is certainly pre-Greek. The two aspects of her character are neatly represented by her two sanctuaries on the Acropolis of Athens. Both appear ancient. The armed and standing Athena of the south side reminds one of the Minoan shield goddess; her cult in the Erechtheum looks to be of at least equal antiquity, being on the site of the Mycenaean palace and being associated with the olive, the snake, and a primitive (probably seated) *xoanon*, not to speak of the fertility ceremonies connected with the site. (See C. J. Herrington, *Athena Parthenos and Athena Polias* [Manchester, 1955].)

⁶ Though Hephaestus is called πολύμητις in the allegorical passage φ 355, and πολύφρων in φ 367 and in the lay of Demodocus (θ 297, 327), in both cases the point is his sagacity, not his dexterity as a craftsman.

into which the evidence for the changing attitude towards Athena can be fitted. But since this framework means the Homeric Question, and the Homeric Question means a library, I shall have to content myself with an unargued statement of my position.

(a) The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are of different authorship. The *Odyssey* is evidently the more recent on both literary and linguistic grounds, though these do not suffice to give any absolute measure of the interval between the two poems.⁷

(b) The *Doloneia* occupies an intermediate position. It is a self-contained lay with a constructional unity of its own. It is independent of the rest of the *Iliad* and is not referred to by it. In this double quality of independence and detachability it is unique among the suspected episodes of the *Iliad*. It is unique also in the possession of ancient testimony to its separate composition.⁸ This testimony receives confirmation from the fact that the book is full of late linguistic forms and usages. On the other hand it is certainly to be dated before the *Odyssey* (see Appendix).

(c) Nevertheless the researches of the last half century on the techniques of oral composition have proved that there is no impossibility in a poem the length of the *Iliad* being the creation of a single author.⁹ That it was so is strongly suggested by its evident unity of conception, and by the very great difficulties encountered in isolating the lays out of which it was once supposed to have been mechanically stitched together. To fix an

⁷ The discussion of *Διὶ φίλος* and *Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος* in the Appendix offers what I believe to be a new proof of the chorizontist position.

⁸ The ancient authorities for the separate composition of the *Doloneia* are Schol. T; Eustathius, 785, 42; Schol. in Dionys. Thrax, 180, 1.

The "overwhelming" linguistic evidence for the lateness of the *Doloneia* has most recently been listed by G. P. Shipp (*Studies in the Language of the Iliad* [Cambridge, 1953]). His methods are not open to those criticisms of the analysts put forward *inter alios* by van Leeuwen in his prefatory remarks on K. The detachability of the book, which clearly makes the argument for its separate composition much stronger, has been queried by Shewan (*The Lay of Dolon*, p. 144), who attempts to see references to K in other books of the *Iliad*. To me these attempts seem unsuccessful.

⁹ Our knowledge of the technique of oral poetry as applied to Homer owes most to Milman Parry. See also Bowra, *Heroic Poetry*.

absolute date within narrow limits for the composition (i.e. first recitation) of the poem is not yet possible. Present evidence suggests a time near the middle of the eighth century.

(d) There was, however, a certain amount of rigidity before this, not only in the existence of formulaic lines and set passages, but in such matters as the geographical setting, the characters of the chief heroes, etc. And the boundary between recitation by heart and improvisation is not necessarily a clear-cut one. In traditional scenes the poet used traditional language without being bound to follow any predecessor verbatim. This seems to be the only assumption to account for the perplexing nature of the linguistic evidence. If you condemn all the books which have late forms, you will have nothing left: even if you restrain yourself to cutting out merely the episodes where they are found, you will keep only the veriest *disiecta membra*. The Quarrel will go, the scenes on Olympus, and so on

Paulatim vello et demo unum, et item unum,
Dum cadat elusus ratione ruentis acervi.

In particular the similes are both linguistically late and sophisticated in literary development.¹⁰ Yet they are essential to the plot. They set the scene, as at the beginning of Γ, they magnify climacterics, and serve in more subtle ways to show character or to pick up the thread of the narrative. The catalogue, whose present form—however genuine its historical information—is undoubtedly late, is introduced by an array of similes. Yet that our *Iliad* was never without it seems guaranteed—as Basset pointed out—by its insertion ὕστερον πρότερον Ὀμηρικῶς (*Harvard Studies*, XXXI, p. 42). The only conclusion is that the poet of the *Iliad* was himself 'late.' Since he worked by improvisation it was always possible for him to drop into a modern colloquialism or to contrive a false archaism. The temptation would not be great in the well-worn paths of battle-narrative. But in the less traditional parts of the poem the audience might well have been more ready to tolerate neologisms, and the poet himself may have found it easier or more congenial to use modern language where his matter was also new.

¹⁰ For 'late' forms in similes and other non-narrative elements in the *Iliad* see, in addition to Shipp, Webster, *Eranos*, LIV, pp. 34-8.

(e) After its composition the *Iliad* was preserved by memory by minstrels belonging to Homer's guild or family—the Homeridae. Though their object was preservation, they had been brought up in an improvising tradition, and the desire to better their heritage must often have been too much for them.

Some such hypothesis as this seems necessary to explain apparently early accretions like © 37-8, I 382-4, I 404-5,¹¹ and in particular the 'compressed readings' where the sense of our *textus receptus* is represented in variants by a shorter number of lines.¹² It seems most likely that in these cases we have examples of modifications made by the Homeridae while the oral tradition of improvisation was still alive.

(f) The success of the *Iliad* precluded any major remodelling of the stories and characters which it had treated. As Horace says, the wise poet *quae desperat tractata nitescere posse relinquit*. (*A. P.*, 150, cf. Aristotle, *Poetics*, 1459b). But creativity—either by the Homeridae or by rival guilds—did not disappear. Hexameter poetry in fact continued to be made in the oral tradition down to a late date as the *Homeric Hymns* show, and it would be surprising if original poems were not composed in the period between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Their subjects could be anything not explicitly treated in the *Iliad*. They might be totally irrelevant to it, as the Lay of Ares and Aphrodite, or explanatory of it as the story of how Troy actually fell, or why Paris seduced Helen. Though the poems of the Trojan Cycle as we have them summarised must be subsequent to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* since they are so explicitly designed to fill up the gaps in the story left by the two great epics, it is clear that some of the Cyclic stories must have been in circulation before the composition of the *Odyssey*. The opening of the *Odyssey* could not refer as it does to the story of Aegisthus to point a moral unless its audience could be assumed to have heard Agamemnon's *nostos*. The account of Demodocus' entertainment (*θ* 74, *θ* 500), assumes familiarity with other stories of Troy.

¹¹ For the archaeological evidence that these accretions belong to the middle or end of the seventh century, see Lorimer, *Homer and the Monuments*, pp. 191, 98, 450 respectively. The first and last examples also contain linguistically 'late' forms—ἐστεφάνωτο and Πυθοῖ (*Shipp*, pp. 44, 134).

¹² E. g. at A 219, I 14-16, M 184 ff., II 89-94, T 76.

Nestor's amazement at the closeness of the friendship between Odysseus and Athena (γ 211 ff.) is certainly not justified by anything in the *Iliad*, and would be vastly exaggerated if it referred to the *Doloneia*. If it is not just politeness, it must refer to later stories, for instance Athena's part in the *ὄπλων κρίσις*.

(g) The *Odyssey* was composed, perhaps commissioned for a festival or some other special occasion, with an eye on the *Iliad*, and possibly as a deliberate rival to it. The natural conclusion from its consistent avoidance of stories already told in the *Iliad* is not that it was ignorant of its predecessor, as Page suggests,¹³ but that it assumed its audience to know them. For the same reason it goes out of its way, particularly in Books I, III, IV, and XI, to satisfy the natural curiosity of those who knew their *Iliad* to discover what happened to the main characters in it. More subjectively one may feel that certain passages are in the nature of parody of its more militarist rival (see note 24) and that the last half of the *Odyssey* has been deliberately padded in an attempt to reach an equivalent length.

These historical assumptions about the growth of the body of Homeric poetry are, I hope, consistent with themselves and with the evidence. If they are correct they should enable us to follow the changes of fashion in thought, especially in the theology since the gods play so large a part in the poems. In particular we should be able to establish and give relative dates to the development of the conception of Athena.

In the *Iliad*, excluding the *Doloneia*, Athena has three principal functions:

1. As a warrior goddess, instilling μένος or giving actual assistance to Greek heroes.
2. As a counsellor giving advice.
3. As a patroness of craftsmanship.

The first fact to notice is that she gives a great deal more practical help than advice. Not counting the instillation of μένος which can be done by anybody or by any speech, she actively helps 21 times, and gives advice only 5 times. Secondly she distributes her favours remarkably evenly to those who receive

¹³ Page, *The Homeric Odyssey*, pp. 149 ff.

them at all. The different proportions seem due to the requirements of the narrative rather than to favouritism. Achilles receives aid 6 times, Diomedes 4 times, Odysseus 3 times, and others occasionally. She never helps Agamemnon, either of the two Ajaxes, Nestor (except as a young soldier at Pylos), Patroclus, Teucer, Idomeneus, Menestheus, or any Trojan.

Whatever the reason for these omissions may be, the pattern of her aid programme appears to rule out any special favouritism towards Odysseus. Nor in her advisory capacity does she give him any noticeably special treatment. Achilles, Tydeus, Diomedes, have one interview each, Odysseus only two. And Nestor's wisdom is quite unprompted by her advice.

As a patroness of craftsmanship she appears only 5 times—though with admirable impartiality (twice in connection with Trojans, twice abstractly in similes, once on Olympus).

If we still want to maintain that in the conception of the poet of the *Iliad* Athena was thought of as responsible for instances of human shrewdness, we must do so in defiance of these figures, and argue that the splendour of her manifestations as a prompter of thought compensates for their paucity. In particular we can point to her famous epiphany to Achilles in the first book. Here surely she personifies the prudence of his second thoughts? But it is Hera who sends her,¹⁴ and it would be a strange thing for a goddess of wisdom to need prompting to act in her own capacity. Similarly it is Hera who prompts Athena's other great manifestation to Odysseus in the assembly in the second book. It may, indeed, be argued that we cannot expect Homer to have no unresolved contradictions. He is not working out an allegory but telling a story. He sees her first as an Olympian, and then

¹⁴ The genuineness of Hera's initiative in the matter, which is put in doubt by the athetesis of one of the references to it (A 195-6), seems guaranteed by the dual *σφώτερον* in line 216. Moreover it was Hera who originally suggested the assembly in line 55, and she may well be considered to have retained an interest in its outcome.

Zenodotus' omission of B 157-68, which excludes Hera's part in Athena's intervention in the flight to the ships, probably shows no more than that one of his texts disliked the long repetition of instructions. It is most unlikely that Hera's part was inserted later, when Athena was becoming famous in connection with Odysseus and Hera falling out of epic fashion (of her seven mentions in the *Odyssey*, none concern the central story).

through the eyes of Achilles. In the plot she is commanded by Hera, but to Achilles she appears as the externalisation of his own mind—his superego as Wade-Gery anachronistically phrases it.¹⁵ In neither aspect is she considered as the representation of wisdom. Athena equally appears to Hector to delude him into turning to face Achilles. One could just as fairly call this externalising the last hope of a desperate man. For the poet of the *Iliad*, who had no foreknowledge that Athena was going to develop into a goddess of wisdom, both appearances serve the same purpose—partly to magnify the event, partly to explain an otherwise bald and arbitrary change of mind on the part of the hero. It is as natural to use a god to explain a psychological event as a physical one. Homer can, if he likes, leave a happening unexplained. What he cannot do is to attribute it to accident. As is well known there is no such word as *τύχη* in his vocabulary. If explanation is wanted, it must be divine. And it is quite easy to see why it was Athena who intervened and came down to Achilles. There was no one else. Messengers, like Iris, take time and usually need a full council of the Gods to send them. But the crisis was urgent with Agamemnon about to be assassinated. The occasion, too, deserves a full deity. But Hera does not make these personal interventions any more than Zeus does. Poseidon is too elemental. The only really available Olympian on the Greek side is Athena. Her dignity is beyond question, but age and sex make it possible for her to persuade rather than order, and thus save what is most important in heroic poetry—the hero's own personal responsibility.

Let us now turn to the *Doloneia*. Here, it seems, is a night raid which calls for cunning rather than valour. Odysseus plays a major part, and so does Athena. Surely the poet is aware of a special relationship between the two based on their common intelligence? But this is to read the poem in the light of ideas derived from later literature, particularly the *Odyssey*.¹⁶ The poet of the *Doloneia* does not go so far. For him Diomedes has an equal share of honour and an equal share of Athena's favour, as we shall see if we examine what he says about each.

¹⁵ Wade-Gery, *The Poet of the Iliad*, p. 41.

¹⁶ That the *Doloneia* is later than the *Odyssey* is sometimes suggested, e. g. by Lorimer, *op. cit.*, p. 485.

The evidence in the Lay for a special relationship between Athena and Odysseus is:

(a) 242 ff.: Diomedes is asked to pick his man and chooses Odysseus:

οὐ πέρι μὲν πρόφρων κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ
ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι, φιλεῖ δέ ἐ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη,
τούτου γ' ἐσπομένοιο καὶ ἐκ πυρὸς αἰθομένοιο
ἄμφω νοστήσaiμεν, ἐπεὶ περίοιδε νοῆσαι.

The first two lines refer to courage and morale, the last two refer to mental quickness and survival capacity. The mention of Athena's love for Odysseus belongs firmly to the first couplet. There is no hint that she loves him specifically for his brains.

(b) 277 ff.: After Athena has sent them the heron as an omen they both offer her a prayer. Odysseus reminds Athena that she has always stood by him, and will she please do so now? Diomedes makes a corresponding claim that she has always stood by his father. Will she now protect him? We have no grounds for choosing to believe Odysseus' claim and denying Diomedes'. And if Tydeus was specially protected by Athena, her relationship with Odysseus was not unique, and she cannot be said to have selected her favourites on intellectual grounds.¹⁷

(c) 460: Odysseus vows to dedicate to Athena Dolon's armour, and swears that he loves her best of the Olympians. This is less significant than it appears out of context. Not only has Athena previously signalled her support of the expedition so that she is

¹⁷ Dümmler (*R. E.*, II, s. v. Athena, col. 1943) cites the stories told of Diomedes' father as evidence that Athena's habit of intervening in aid of warriors was earlier than the *Iliad*. But a tale which purports to deal with an earlier period is not necessarily itself older, as Wade-Gery showed in 1948 ("What happened in Pylos," *A. J. A.*, LII, pp. 15 ff.). Nestor's youthful exploits, so far from belonging to the earliest days, are to be referred to the dark age after the collapse of the Pylian kingdom. Nor, to come back to the divine aid given Tydeus, need Homer have been accurately reporting an authority: his motive may just as well have been to glorify Diomedes. Indeed the linguistic evidence that makes the similes and the theology 'late' does the same for the references to Tydeus! It seems that the correct inference to be drawn from the linguistic lateness of so many of the digressions—some of which, like the description of the boars' tusk helmet, contain undoubtedly old material—is that the poet was condensing or paraphrasing. (See Webster, *Eranos*, LIV, pp. 44 f.)

the natural recipient of such a vow, but in 560 ff. Athena receives—or thinks she does—a similar expression of esteem from Menelaus. But nobody infers from that the existence of any special bond between the two.

Compare the relations indicated between Athena and Diomede.

(a) The expedition, of which she is patroness, is primarily his, and it is he who killed not only the twelve companions but also the king.

(b) She twice gives him μένος (366 and 482), and once advises him to make good his escape (507 ff.). This is admittedly not much, but it is more than is granted to Odysseus, who never gets a word out of her.

(c) She arranged that Rhesus, at the moment of his murder should be having a nightmare about Diomede (497).

In his speech of congratulation on the successful return of the two heroes, Nestor says (553) that Zeus and Athena love them both. This seems a just summary of the position. The poet of K thought of Athena still as a warrior goddess, though perhaps with a *penchant* for stratagem. Further than this one cannot go. It is inconceivable that he knew of the very special relationship between Athena and Odysseus established by the *Odyssey*, or of its intellectual basis about which Athena is quite explicit. "Among mankind you are far the best in speech and counsel, and I am famous among all the gods for cleverness and cunning" (ν 297-9, cf. ν 331-2).

It thus appears that Athena's reputation for μῆτις developed *pari passu* with her favouritism for Odysseus. Both are embryonic in the *Iliad*. Odysseus is visited and aided by Athena, but not as frequently as other heroes. He is not yet marked out as a unique favourite. One cannot attach much weight to the lesser Ajax's petulant complaint after his athletic defeat that Athena has always stood by him like a mother (Ψ 784). It probably means no more than "he always has the luck," and in any case conveys no hint of any intellectual bond. Once, in passing, Diomede calls Athena πολύβουλος (E 260), and here there is no connection with Odysseus. The only time the two things are apparently associated is when Athena advises Odysseus how to stop the mutiny. But though her advice is certainly

'wise,' it comes originally from Hera, and though Odysseus' 'wisdom' is specially mentioned, it is in a form which compares it to that of Zeus (Δὲ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος, see *infra* and Appendix). In the *Doloneia* we see Athena's patronage of cunning, and her connection with Odysseus, both somewhat further emphasized. Finally in the *Odyssey* the two strands are fully developed and woven together. And if we ask who made the running in their friendship, the answer is clear—Odysseus. In the *Iliad* Athena has not acquired any divine monopoly in stratagems, or any stock epithets for cleverness. Odysseus already has. Among the Greek heroes he is the quickest on the uptake, and the most plausible speaker. And some of his stock epithets suggest that these qualities are no new acquisition. It would be surprising if they were. The development of type characters represents a comparatively primitive stage in the development of a heroic poetry. And Odysseus must have been earmarked almost from the beginning as the man of cunning.

Athena acquired her reputation for μῆτις and βουλή as a result of the part she played in Homeric poetry. It was a post-migration, Ionian, development. Yet the two allegorising accounts of her birth in the Boeotian *Theogony* are clearly composed to aetiologise this conception of her character, and must therefore presuppose an audience whose ideas had been moulded by Homeric epic.¹⁸

I should like to conclude by considering some related problems. The concept of Athena is not the only element in which the theology of the *Odyssey* differs from that of the *Iliad*. Zeus himself is greatly changed. He has lost his concern for individual men. In the *Iliad* he is three times stated to love par-

¹⁸ Another strong indication of the influence of Homer on the Boeotian tradition is the apparentage of Phobos and Deimos to Ares and Aphrodite. They make strange brothers for Harmonia, and contrast with the care normally taken to keep families compatible in temperament. Moreover, as Solmsen points out (*Hesiod and Aeschylus*, p. 55 and *passim*) the children of the Olympians belong to a new order. Their names symbolise peace, good government, and the happier arts of mankind. The proper family for Phobos and Deimos to have belonged to was that of Night (*Theog.*, 211 ff.). They would there have found brothers and sisters of like mind. The only motive one can see for their exclusion from this family and their attribution to Ares is the influence of the *Iliad* (see Δ 440, Α 37, Ν 299, Ο 119).

ticular mortals, and several times people are compared to him in counsel—*Δὲ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος*. *Δὲ φίλος* is a frequent epithet. None of these phrases occurs in the *Odyssey*. Zeus has become far more impartial, dignified, and remote—just as his dwelling-place, Olympus, is no longer regarded as an earthly mountain. It does not seem to me that this change would take place except in an atmosphere where there was a great deal of interest in stories about the gods and their activities. That this interest existed in the final stages of Greek epic is suggested by the existence of the *Homeric Hymns*. Before these there is the story of Ares and Aphrodite told in Book Eight of the *Odyssey*, which looks like a typical lay of the post-Iliadic period. So, perhaps, is also the story of the Hanging of Hera (O 18 ff.) if Zenodotus' omission of it is evidence of its later insertion into the body of the *Iliad*. Outside the direct Homeric tradition we have the *Theogony*. In fact there can be little doubt of the existence of lively theological speculation in post-Iliadic times. Can we go further and date the beginning of this interest? Can we say, in fact, when the vivid personalisation of the gods, which we associate with the name of Olympian religion, first took place? I think we can establish a strong likelihood that it is to be dated to a comparatively recent stage in the Homeric tradition.

(a) Approximately 30% of the lines or passages in our *textus receptus* of the *Iliad* athetised or omitted by Alexandrian scholars have a theological purport. In this count I have not included lines which merely expand information about the gods or their actions which has already been given. 30% is a large proportion in view of the fact that so many of the athetised lines are made up of trivial expansions and explanations. Its significance of course depends on the position we take on the question of the athetised lines in general. If we disbelieve altogether in the objective integrity of the Alexandrians, we can only regard the athetised lines as evidence for the prejudices of Ptolemaic times. But neither this nor the supposition that they represent lines casually omitted by later copyists seems to tally with the probabilities. The most likely explanation is that the Alexandrians did have access to genuinely early manuscripts, and that these manuscripts differed. In this case it is likely that the athetised lines represent early accretions, and we can use them as evidence for the religious interest of the first Homeridae.

(b) In particular it is worth considering the possible deductions from II 89-94, to which Shipp (*Studies in the Language of the Iliad*, p. 110) draws attention. Achilles is briefing Patroclus. Six lines of our text were for Zenodotus represented by three. One of the lines Zenodotus omits says of the Trojans

μάλα τούς γε φιλεῖ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων.

Compare the athetised line B 197:

τιμὴ δ' ἐκ Διὸς ἐστι, φιλεῖ δέ ἐ μῆτιέτα Ζεὺς.

This is said of Zeus-nurtured kings, and there can be no political motive for its athetisation in Ptolemaic Egypt. Zenodotus must have had textual evidence for his reading. The theology of the two passages shows that they belong to the same stratum of tradition. And we can date this stratum as late in relation to the *Iliad*, early in relation to the post-Iliadic poetry. It is "late" because of the contraction φιλεῖ, "early" for the following reasons. The difference in the first passage between the text of Zenodotus and of the *textus receptus* is due to remodelling and not to simple addition or subtraction. Thus the improvising tradition was still alive. In the second passage, the relationship assumed between Zeus and mortals contradicts the conception we find in the *Odyssey*, where Zeus is never said to love people (see *infra*, p. 132). The same relationship is expressed in K 552 = H 280,

ἀμφοτέρω γὰρ σφῶε φιλεῖ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς.

The *Doloneia* occurrence belongs to the period between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. This only leaves H 280. There is no external evidence to show that this line was not used by the poet of the *Iliad*. If it is genuine, its uniqueness and the "late" or colloquial contraction in φιλεῖ suggest that the line was composed by the poet himself rather than inherited from a predecessor.

(c) These inferences are reinforced by the general linguistic lateness of the theological passages and comments. As Shipp's work shows, these are on the same linguistic level as the similes. The similes, for literary reasons, can confidently be assigned to the final stages of the growth of the *Iliad* tradition, and in their more complex forms are likely to be original to the actual composer of the poem. This fact is reflected in their language; and

it is a reasonable conclusion that if the language of the theological passages is also late, the explanation is the same. The theology is largely "Homer"'s creation. Thus we can vindicate Herodotus' very definite statement of opinion: "It is only since yesterday, one might say, or the day before, that the Greeks have known their gods—how each was born or whether they have always existed, what character they have, and what they look like. I take Hesiod and Homer to be four hundred years earlier than myself and not more. It is they who created for the Greeks their theogony, who gave the gods their titles, who differentiated their offices and skills, and explained their characteristics" (Herodotus, II, 53).

That Greek epic should not only reflect but should have played a major part in the development of Greek theology is not altogether a surprising conclusion. One cannot suppose that Homeric minstrels are in every respect to be compared with the illiterate bards who survive in the modern world. They must have been intellectuals in their day.¹⁹ And their theological activity was ultimately that of analysing implicit assumptions about human behaviour. It is progress to refer the inexplicable to the operation of a god. It means that at any rate you have consciously distinguished between the normal course of events and the abnormal, instead of taking them all for granted. But the Ionian poets went further. They asked insistently what sort of a god. This exploration, which must have called for great freedom from prejudice and considerable intellectual honesty, led them eventually to their vivid differentiation of divine characters. It is easier to smile at their achievement, as later

¹⁹ A constant to and fro of critical questioning must be posited to account not only for the intense rationalism of the *Iliad* (contrast the *Kalevala*, etc.) but also for the consistency and watertightness of the story-telling. A small instance will illustrate. In A 123-9 Achilles speaks on the impossibility of granting Agamemnon immediate compensation for the loss of Chryseis. He says

πῶς γάρ τοι δώσουσι γέρας μεγάθυμοι Ἀχαιοί;
οὐδέ τί πον ἴδμεν ξυνήια κείμενα πολλά·
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολίων ἐξεπράθομεν, τὰ δέδασται,
λαοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐπέοικε παλλίλλογα ταῦτ' ἐπαγείρειν.

The only motive for these lines can be to answer the potential criticism from a politically conscious audience "Why not just vote him a reward from the public monies?"

satirists did, than to realise its magnitude. The only way to escape from a false assumption is to clarify its implications.²⁰ The idea came to him. Why? A god sent it. What god? Athena. Why did she? To help the Achaeans because she hated the Trojans. Why did she hate the Trojans? Because . . . , etc. Athena has now become an individual. The vagueness is resolved, but the absurdity manifested. To explain what you mean by her you must make her more human; but the more explicit her humanity, the less credible it becomes that she can be prompting people all over the world simultaneously. The only way to keep a god is to keep him vague—like the Stoic Zeus. The crystal gods of Homer needed only to be created to pass from the sphere of intellectual acceptance, and leave the way clear for naturalistic attempts to explain the world. It is no coincidence that Ionian science and humanism sprang up among the same people and in immediate succession to the Homeric epic. It is not that they were merely different manifestations of a national genius, but that the work of the one tradition was a necessary preliminary to the work of the other.

²⁰ Piaget, *The Child's Conception of the World* (*passim*) shows that the animist conceptions of children become their most explicit when they are about to be discarded. The parallels between children's logic and mythopoeic thought, which are both numerous and of high interest, do not of course prove that Homer's mental age was six, that children repeat racial memories, or any such facile mysticism. Rather they show the universal homogeneity of the human mind, and what solutions appear most obvious to it when first exploring the problems of the universe.

APPENDIX.

THE EPITHETS OF ODYSSEUS IN THE *ILIAD*, THE *DOLONEIA*,
AND THE *ODYSSEY*.*Epithets of Odysseus.*

+ = the epithet is used in the poem to describe characters other than Odysseus.

* = the epithet is confined to Odysseus.

Where a line reference is given, the epithet is used of Odysseus only once.

	<i>Iliad</i> (except K)	K	<i>Odyssey</i>
ἀμύμων	+ 0	+ 0	+ saepe
ἄναξ	+ 0	+ 0	+ saepe
ἀντίθεος	+ Δ 140	+ 0	+ saepe
δαίφρων	+ Δ 482	+ 0	+ 10
διογενές (in stock line)	* 6	* K 144	* saepe
“ (alone)	+ 0	* 0	* κ 443
διογενής	+ 0	* K 340	* 7
δῖος	+ saepe	+ K 460	+ saepe
Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος	+ 3	* K 137	* 0
Διὶ φίλος	+ 2	+ K 527	* 0
δόλων ἄτ’	* Δ 430	* 0	* ν 293
δουρικλυτός	+ 4	+ 0	+ 0
δύστηνος	+ 0	* 0	+ saepe
ἔσθλός	+ 0	+ 0	+ 3
θεῖος	+ 3	+ K 243	+ saepe
Ἰθακήσιος	+ 0	* 0	* 2
κυδάλιμος	+ 0	+ 0	+ 2
Λαερτιάδης (see διογενές)	* 6	* K 144	* saepe
“ (not in stock line)	* Γ 200	* 0	* saepe
μεγάθυμος	+ 0	+ 0	+ ο 2
μεγαλήτωρ	+ E 674	* 0	+ 6
ποικιλομήτης	* Δ 482	* 0	* 6
πολύαινε	* 2	* K 544 = I 673	* μ 184
πολύμητις	+ saepe	* 6	* saepe
πολυμήχανος (v. διογενές)	* 6	* K 144	* saepe (see note on word)
πολύτλας δῖος	* 4	* K 248 = I 276	* saepe
πολύτροπος	* 0	* 0	* 2
πολύφρων	+ 0	* 0	+ 6 (in same stock line)
πολλίπορθος	+ B 278	* K 363	* 8 (inc. -ιος)
ταλασίφρων	+ Δ 466	* 0	* 7
ὁ τλήμων	* 0	* 2	* 0
φαίδιμος	+ 0	+ 0	+ 4

The preceding is a list, intended to be complete, of all the epithets of stock type applied to Odysseus in the *Iliad*, the *Doloneia*, and the *Odyssey*.

Inspection of the list confirms what we have seen from its treatment of Athena, that the *Doloneia* is closer to the *Iliad* than to the *Odyssey*. Every epithet it applies to Odysseus has precedent in the *Iliad*. On the other hand it does not apply to Odysseus those epithets which are used of him in the *Odyssey* and not in the *Iliad* (e.g. ἀμύμων, ἄναξ, δύστηνος, ἐσθλός, κυδάλιμος, πολύφρων, φαίδιμος) or the epithet πολύτροπος which is peculiar to the *Odyssey* and very likely a special coinage since it so well summarizes the character in which Odysseus is regarded there. Two important epithets, Δὺ φίλος and Δὺ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος, which are avoided by the poet of the *Odyssey*, are used in the *Doloneia*.

For difference between the *Iliad* and the *Doloneia* the list offers only slight evidence. The *Iliad* uses δουρικλυτός of Odysseus; the *Doloneia* and the *Odyssey* do not, although they both know the word. This is in keeping with Odysseus' association with the bow, which is stressed in both the later poems. ὁ τλήμων is unique to the *Doloneia*, and διογενής occurs of Odysseus outside the stock line. In both cases the article is noteworthy. These minor differences between K and the rest of the *Iliad* would certainly not be conclusive by themselves, but they support the rest of the evidence for the separate composition of the poem.

Considered individually the epithets suggest some interesting conclusions:

Δὺ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος: ἀτάλαντος is used with freedom by the *Iliad* (26 times in seven different phrases describing eleven different characters). In the *Odyssey* it occurs only twice—each time in the phrase θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος used of Patroclus (γ 110, P 477) and of Neleus (γ 409). Nevertheless this suffices to show that the *Odyssey* knew the word, and we may wonder why it did not employ it elsewhere. I can think of three possible explanations:

(a) ἀτάλαντος may have already sounded archaic, and thus be suitable only in the mouth of Nestor or in describing his father.

(b) Or its meaning may have been quite forgotten. Neither

θεόφιν nor μήστωρ occurs elsewhere in the *Odyssey*. The phrase may have been taken over from P 477 without understanding.

(c) But if the *Odyssey* borrows mechanically, the phrase Δὲ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος could equally have been taken over. Why wasn't it? It may have been objectionable for either its scansion or its meaning. Let us consider the phrase in conjunction with Δὲ φίλος where the same problem arises.

Δὲ φίλος: Used 17 times in the *Iliad* (of Achilles 5 times, Hector 4, Odysseus 3, Patroclus, Phoenix, Apollo, the father of a hero in the Catalogue, and of heralds). Why does the *Odyssey* not use the word?

(a) The first possibility is that the *Odyssey* did not know it. Page²¹ uses the word in his list of verbal variations to prove that the *Odyssey* is a cousin rather than a descendant of the *Iliad*. Even if this unorthodox view is correct, the common ancestor cannot be very far back. There are over two hundred repeated lines in common between the two poems. And Δὲ φίλος because of its free application in the *Iliad* and the archaic scansion of its second syllable²² is not likely to be a recent coinage in the tradition. Moreover the occurrences of ἀτάλαντος mentioned above make Page's view difficult. θεόφιν μήστωρ ἀτάλαντος must, according to his reasoning, have been a current epic phrase in the time of the common ancestor, and Δὲ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος either was not invented then or was dropped by the poets of the *Odyssey* branch of the tradition. But θεόφιν μήστωρ ἀτάλαντος is used by Nestor to describe Patroclus in just the same way as Automedon had used it, and in almost the same line (γ 110, P 477). It is used once, soon afterwards, in the same scene of the *Odyssey*, and never again. Is this coincidence? If not, the only alternative is that it was already a fixed epithet for Patroclus. But is Patroclus of such antiquity in the tradition? Or could there be a less suitable epithet to describe a young man and one who is not even a full hero? But you may think such literary feeling subjective. In that case can you disregard the powerful linguistic argument put forward for the comparative lateness of θεόφιν μήστωρ ἀτάλαντος.²³ The phrase seems almost

²¹ Page, *The Homeric Odyssey*, pp. 149 ff.

²² Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, 112, i.

²³ Shipp, *op. cit.*, p. 7, n. 2.

certainly derived from $\Delta\acute{\upsilon}$ $\mu\eta\tau\iota\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$. $\Delta\acute{\upsilon}$ $\mu\eta\tau\iota\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ must therefore have been current before the two traditions separated. The adoption of Page's view does not release us from the problem. The *Odyssey* dropped a phrase which it knew. Whether it knew it from its own previous tradition or from the *Iliad* is for this purpose immaterial. The poet must have had a reason and we are entitled to ask what it was.

(b) $\Delta\acute{\upsilon}$ $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ and $\Delta\acute{\upsilon}$ $\mu\eta\tau\iota\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ both necessitate scanning $\Delta\acute{\upsilon}$ as an iamb. The *Odyssey* may have declined to use either phrase because the long vowel of the dative singular was too archaic.²⁴ ($\Delta\acute{\upsilon}$ is only elsewhere iambic in the stock expression $\delta\iota\upsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\mu\omicron\iota\omicron$ which occurs in both poems, but whose etymology and meaning may well have been forgotten.) This scansional conscience on the part of the poet of the *Odyssey* accounts for the facts, but does not have a very convincing ring.

(c) The most natural explanation is that both phrases were meaningful, and that the *Odyssey* disliked the meaning. The poet must have felt that Zeus was too omnipotent and majestic to have particular human friendships, and that it would seem either arrogant or absurdly exaggerated to compare a man's $\mu\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$ with that of Zeus.

$\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\mu\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$: There is only one instance in the epics— Φ 355, certainly not an early passage—where this does not refer to Odysseus. In the *Homeric Hymns* it is used of Hermes (*H. H.*, IV, 319) and of Athena (*H. H.*, XXVIII, 2). It would seem both from its convenient scansion and its highly appropriate meaning to be a coinage made specifically to describe Odysseus.

$\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\acute{\eta}\chi\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$: The word occurs 7 times in the *Iliad*, and 14 times in the *Odyssey* in the stock line

$\Delta\iota\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ $\Lambda\alpha\epsilon\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta$, $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\acute{\eta}\chi\alpha\nu'$ $\text{'}\text{Οδυσσε\ddot{υ}}$.

The vocative occurs in a variant line spoken by Agamemnon's ghost in the certainly late "continuation":

$\delta\lambda\beta\iota\epsilon$ $\Lambda\alpha\acute{\epsilon}\rho\tau\alpha\omicron$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota$, $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\mu\acute{\eta}\chi\alpha\nu'$ $\text{'}\text{Οδυσσε\ddot{υ}}$.

The nominative occurs only once, when Athena assures Telemachus that Odysseus will be scheming ways and means for his

²⁴ See note 22.

return ἐπεὶ πολυμήχανός ἐστι. πολυμηχανή occurs once—also in the continuation—

καὶ Κίρκης κατέλεξε δόλον πολυμηχανήν τε.

This is a good example of a word emancipating itself. There can be little doubt that the compound was coined not only as an epithet for Odysseus, but also specifically for the stock line; and that only later was it felt to be familiar enough for more general use.

πολύαινε, on the other hand, never occurs except in this case and in reference to Odysseus.

πολύτλας similarly never emancipates itself from the phrase πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς which is found five times in the *Iliad* (in 'late' books—if there are such things—© 97, I 676 = K 248, Ψ 729, 778), and thirty-six times in the *Odyssey*.

πολιόροθος: The fact that this epithet remains in favour in the *Odyssey* whereas δουρικλυτός does not suggests that in its avoidance of the latter it is not the militarism which it objects to but specifically the allusion to spearmanship. The *Odyssey*, like the *Doloneia*, thinks of Odysseus particularly as a bowman. These epithets are used not as mere metrical counters, but with a sensitivity to their meaning.

Note also the emancipated variant πολιπόρθιος (ι 504).

ὁ τλήμων: For the articles see Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, II, pp. 240, 245. The precedent for K's use of the word is perhaps E 670 Ὀδυσσεύς /τλήμονα θυμὸν ἔχων. The only other occurrence of the word is Φ 430 where Athena calls the gods who assist Troy θαρσαλέοι καὶ τλήμονες. The word is not found in the *Odyssey*. ἀνθρώπων τλημοσύνας occurs in the *Hymn to Apollo*, 191.

πολύφρων: It seems impossible to apply to this word our previous conclusion and derive all its occurrences from the stock line in which it is most frequently found—νοστήσαι Ὀδυσσῆα πολύφρονα ὄνδε δόμενδε (α 83, ξ 424, υ 239, φ 204, υ 329). Not only does the line itself seem of such poor quality as to be unworthy to receive the gift of a new mintage, but we should be reduced to special pleading to prove that the word's two occurrences in the *Iliad* were post-Odyssean. Admittedly in Φ 368, Ἥφαιστοιο βίηφι πολύφρονος, the genitive dependent on βίηφι (see Shipp, *op. cit.*,

p. 10) and the allegorical context make it plausible to call the line 'late.' And the original application of the epithet to Hephaestus is perhaps more likely to have been in the end-tag *πολύφρονος* 'Ηφαίστοιο as in θ 297, 327, than in the order of Φ 368. But these considerations are quite inadequate to prove the dependence of the latter on the *Odyssey*. Even worse is the case with Σ 108

καὶ χόλος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ χαλεπῆναι

which forms an integral part of Achilles' speech, and which can hardly be independent of ξ 464

οἶνος . . .

ἧλεος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ μάλ' ἀεῖσαι.

The lines ξ 462 ff. read extremely like a parody of the *Iliad*,²⁵ and one is tempted to assume that the poet must have had in mind either the passage in Achilles' speech, or a similar epic *sententia*.

Both from the more intellectual concept of the *φρένες* that its sense implies, and from the pattern of its occurrences, *πολύφρων* would seem a decidedly later coinage than *πρόφρων*. It might therefore be expected to have left a trace of its original use. Odysseus, though the obvious person for the epithet to have been invented for, is not called it in the *Iliad*. The passage in the *Iliad* where it is applied to Hephaestus has marks of "lateness." The earliest looking of our extant passages is Σ 108. It is conceivable that a gnomic phrase of the pattern

. . . ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ . . .

²⁵ Not only is the whole attitude taken in ξ 462 ff. towards the Trojan war mock-heroic, but the motif of the cloak may be suggested by B 183, where Odysseus drops his cloak in his haste to check the mutiny. The line was a favourite among moralists in later antiquity to show the superiority of character to clothing, and it is possible enough that the sermon in the incident was an early discovery. Certainly the passage in the *Odyssey* is well suited to guy such a moralising interpretation. Among the verbal parallels with the *Iliad* are ξ 464, cf. Σ 108; ξ 468, cf. H 157, etc.; ξ 471a, cf. A 271; ξ 471b, cf. A 270, all of which seem to gain considerably in point if they are conscious parodies of the *Iliad*. In fact for the line

εἶθ' ὥς ἡβώοιμι βίη τέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη

we have virtual certainty. It occurs twice in this story, and nowhere else in the *Odyssey*.

was its birth-place. Compare the similar pattern of Δ 421

. . . ὑπό κεν ταλασίφρονά περ δέος εἶλε,

and of N 300

Φόβος . . .

ἔσπετο, ὅς τ' ἐφόβησε ταλάφρονά περ πολεμιστήν.

The results arrived at in these notes on the individual epithets may be summarised under three heads:

1. *The increasing dignity and remoteness of Zeus.* This seems to be the reason for the later dropping of the epithets Διὶ φίλος and Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντος.

2. *The meaningfulness of stock-epithets.* The discarding of traditional epithets because of a no longer palatable meaning shows that to the Homeric poet—at least when the art of epic was at its peak—the epithets were felt as meaningful and not just used as line-fillers for purely metrical convenience.

3. *Newly-coined words.* In some instances it seems possible to detect the line or metrical formula for which a particular word was coined. As the line was repeated the new word became familiar. It could then be weaned from its original matrix and pass into the normal stock of epic vocabulary.

M. W. M. POPE.

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN.

CICERO ON THE *COMITIA CENTURIATA*:

DE RE PUBLICA, II, 22, 39-40.*

Nearly all recent discussions of the third century reform of the *Comitia Centuriata* have started from the assumption that some of Cicero's observations in *De Re Publica*, II, 22 may be treated as evidence for the nature of that reform.¹ The aim of the present paper is to demonstrate that the assumption is not valid, and to support the demonstration by a fresh interpretation of what Cicero has to say about the *Comitia Centuriata*.

At *De Re Publica*, I, 46, 70 Scipio Aemilianus, the principal speaker in the dialogue, announces his intention of giving an account of the Roman constitution as established by the ancestors and transmitted to the present generation. In II, 1, 1-3 he says that his discourse is derived from the elder Cato, and that in accordance with Cato's own practice it will go back to the *origo* of the Roman people. *Libenter enim etiam verbo utor Catonis*, he adds. Thus Cicero delicately indicates his main source, Cato's historical work *Origines*.

Scipio promises that he will set forth the historical development of the Roman state, from its birth to its full maturity

* I should like to express my thanks to Professor A. D. Momigliano, who read a first draft of this paper, for his courteous advice and assistance, without in any way involving him in responsibility for the opinions here put forward.

¹ The solitary exception is A. dell' Oro, "Rogatio e riforma dei comizi centuriati," *Parola del Passato*, XIV (1950), pp. 138 ff. His view of the Ciceronian passage has been adequately refuted by J. J. Nicholls, "The Reform of the *Comitia Centuriata*," *A. J. P.*, LXXVII (1956), pp. 235 f. The views of E. Schönbauer, "Die römische Centurien-Verfassung in neuer Quellenschau," *Historia*, II (1953), pp. 35 ff., and "Die Centurien-Reform," *Studi in memoria di E. Albertario*, I, pp. 699 ff. have been discussed by Nicholls, *op. cit.*, pp. 236 ff. and E. S. Staveley, "The Constitution of the Roman Republic 1940-1954," *Historia*, V (1956), pp. 115 ff., and their criticisms appear conclusive.

The most recent treatment of the whole subject, L. R. Taylor's paper, "The Centuriate Assembly Before and After the Reform," *A. J. P.*, LXXVIII (1957), pp. 337 ff., illustrates the general tendency to take for granted the applicability of the Ciceronian passage to the reformed assembly.

(*et nascentem et crescentem et adultam et iam firmam atque robustam*). The historical narrative that follows reveals that the translation of the metaphor is: "from the beginnings, through the regal period, to the time when the Republic was firmly on its feet, about the middle of the fifth century." Scipio does not concern himself with developments after the fifth century B. C. The major portion of his story deals with the regal period, and at II, 21, 37 he arrives at the reign of Servius Tullius. There is a lacuna in the text between §38 and §39, but there is, of course, no doubt that when the text resumes in §39, the reign of Servius is still the subject under discussion.

The passage which is to be discussed (39) runs as follows:—

. . . duodeviginti censu maximo. deinde equitum magno numero ex omni populi summa separato relicuum populum distribuit in quinque classes senioresque a iunioribus divisit easque ita disparavit ut suffragia non in multitudinis sed in locupletium potestate essent, curavitque, quod semper in re publica tenendum est, ne plurimum valeant plurimi. quae discriptio si esset ignota vobis, explicaretur a me;

At this point textual trouble sets in, unfortunately in the vital passage. The only MS (Vat. 5757) presents a text wherein the readings of the first hand (V¹) are clearly corrupt and have been corrected and added to by a second hand (V²). V¹'s text is as follows:—

nunc rationem videtis esse talem ut equitum certamine cum et suffragiis et prima classis addita centuria quae ad summum usum urbis fabris t*<i>*gnariis est data VIII centurias—tot enim relicuae sunt—octo solae si accesserunt, confecta est vis populi universa, relicuaeque multo maior multitudo sex et nonaginta centuriarum neque excluderetur suffragiis, ne superbum esset, nec valeret nimis, ne esset periculosum.

The text generally printed by editors is based on V²'s corrections and supplements. In the following extract the changes due to V² are shown in italics:—

nunc rationem videtis esse talem ut equitum *centuriae* cum *sex* suffragiis et prima classis, addita centuria quae ad summum usum urbis fabris tignariis est data, *LXXXVIII* centurias *habeat; quibus ex centum quattuor centuriis*—tot enim. . . .

The rest of the passage (40) is straightforward:—

in quo etiam verbis ac nominibus ipsis fuit diligens; qui cum locupletis assiduos appellasset ab asse dando, eos qui aut non plus mille quingentos aeris aut omnino nihil in suum censum praeter caput attulissent, proletarios nominavit, ut ex iis quasi proles, id est quasi progenies civitatis, exspectari videretur. illarum autem sex et nonaginta centuriarum in una centuria tum quidem plures censebantur quam paene in prima classe tota. ita nec prohibebatur quisquam iure suffragii, et is valebat in suffragio plurimum, cuius plurimum intererat esse in optimo statu civitatem. quin etiam accensis velatis, liticinibus, cornicinibus,^{1a} proletariis. . . .

(*desiderantur paginae quattuor*)

Now it is evident that Servius is the grammatical subject both of the verbs *distribuit*, *divisit*, *disparavit*, *curavit*, in §39 and of the verbs *fuit*, *appellavit*, *nominavit*, in §40. In fact, the critical passage (*quae descriptio . . . periculosum*) is surrounded by verbs denoting actions of Servius; and when §40 begins, there is no indication at all that the acts of Servius have at any point ceased to be the subject under discussion. The words *quae descriptio* clearly constitute a resumption of the preceding verbs *distribuit*, *divisit*, *disparavit*; and since these verbs describe acts of Servius, it follows that *quae descriptio* means the *descriptio* made by Servius. Therefore, when Scipio says: "if that *descriptio* were unknown to you, I should expound it," he is unquestionably referring to the Servian *descriptio*; and it is clear that the exposition which his audience's familiarity with the subject makes it unnecessary for him to offer is such an exposition as is found in Livy, I, 43 and Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities*, IV, 16 ff., an exposition in detail of the organization set up by Servius. These points are painfully obvious, but it is necessary to stress them because they seem to be often slurred over.

Accordingly, when Scipio proceeds in the next clause, beginning *nunc rationem videtis*, to present certain selected figures relating to the *Comitia Centuriata* and certain inferences as to the political results of the organization, the obvious and natural interpretation of his words in their context is that they will refer to the Servian system. This conclusion is confirmed by the next

^{1a} *liticinibus* V¹; *cornicinibus* V²; K. Ziegler (Teubner, 1958) reads only *cornicinibus*; other editors *liticinibus cornicinibus*.

sentence, at the beginning of §40, *in quo . . . fuit diligens*. The phrase *in quo* can only be a resumption of the preceding sentences, equivalent, in other words, to *in qua discriptione*; while *fuit diligens* shows that the arrangements described in those sentences, including the facts and inferences presented in the clause beginning *nunc rationem videtis*, are derived from consideration of the organization attributed to Servius himself.

But Mommsen adopted a different, and less natural, interpretation of the context.² And this interpretation, with modifications, is the foundation for theories employing the Ciceronian passage as evidence for the reform.³ Mommsen held that Cicero treats the Servian and the reformed assemblies as if they were equivalent, and that he is entitled to do so, because, for his purposes, which are political, not antiquarian, the differences were not significant. According to the Mommsenian view, the arrangements described and implied in the clause *nunc rationem videtis . . .*, etc. belong to the *Comitia Centuriata* in its re-organized form.

² *Staatsrecht*, III, p. 275, n. 1; *Droit Public Romain*, VI, 1, p. 311, n. 4.

³ P. Fraccaro in "La riforma dell' ordinamento centuriato," *Studi in onore di P. Bonfante*, I (1929), pp. 105 ff. subjects Mommsen's justification of his view to a devastating critique, but nevertheless retains the essential part of the view, that the *ratio* is that of the reformed assembly. Moreover, recognising the formidable difficulty encountered by his own view, he appears to be willing to fall back on precisely that Mommsenian view he had previously torn to pieces. See pp. 112-13 of his paper, especially: "Posso anche ammettere che tutto questo mio ragionamento sia errato e che la menzione delle 96 centurie della minoranza nel passo testè riferito di Cicerone, nel quale il soggetto è indubbiamente Servio, dimostri invece che anche sopra Cicerone intende parlare dell' ordinamento serviano; ma in tal caso è necessario . . . ritenere . . . che Cicerone abbia sostituito interamente al serviano l'ordinamento riformato" (my italics). Fraccaro gives no indication how he would defend this return to Mommsen's position. It is therefore hard to see why Staveley, "The Reform of the Comitia Centuriata," *A. J. P.*, LXXIV (1953), p. 5, considered that Fraccaro had shown "conclusively" in this part of his paper that Cicero must be referring to the centuriate organization as of the late 2nd century B. C. In fact, adherents of the view which I call for convenience 'Mommsenian' have generally shown this tendency to avoid the difficult task of defending their interpretation of Cicero's actual words, by referring to earlier discussions. That is why it is still necessary to consider Mommsen's statement of the case for the defence.

There seem to be overwhelming objections to this kind of interpretation. They may be detailed as follows:—

(a) Though the general trend of the *De Re Publica* is undoubtedly political (or rather, politico-philosophical), the special purpose of this part of the work is to give a historical account of the development of the Roman constitution up to the middle of the fifth century, based primarily on the authority of Cato. To interpolate descriptions of contemporary institutions into the account must inevitably give a distorted impression of the constitutional development, especially when the divergences from the original institution, whether insignificant or not, were clearly marked. Yet the Mommsenian view requires us to suppose that Cicero was either obtuse enough not to realise this or guilty of deliberately perpetrating such a travesty of historical method. The work is neither a political speech nor a political pamphlet, in which the author might be expected to take liberties with the facts if it suited his partisan purpose, but a would-be serious contribution to political thought. Its claim to that status would be jeopardized if Cicero were found tampering with historical truth. Indeed, there is in the correspondence with Atticus ample evidence of Cicero's care for historical accuracy, even in minutiae.⁴ The assessment which the upholders of the Mommsenian view are forced to make of Cicero's attitude to history is far too depreciative.

(b) We may fairly assume that Cicero could, if he had wished, have given an account of the Servian centuriate organization, that is, of the organization as it was before the reform; the citation of the authority of Cato, born only seven years after the earliest possible date for the reform (241 B. C.), seems to guarantee this. Why then should Cicero have deliberately avoided giving an account of the Servian organization? Why should he have preferred to interpolate, in the middle of a description of the activities of Servius Tullius, an account of the reformed centuriate organization? Mommsen's answer is that Cicero had to refer to the contemporary system because he

⁴ For detailed references see M. Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire Romaine* (1953), pp. 55-7. Rambaud devotes most of his third chapter to a critical examination of the historical part of the *De Re Publica* and establishes beyond question its claim to be a serious piece of historical writing.

could not assume a general knowledge of the nature of the Servian arrangements. This might have been the case if the *De Re Publica* had been intended for, so to speak, mass consumption. But since, by the nature of the work, this could hardly be so, since, in fact, it must have been directed at a reading public on the same social and intellectual level as Cicero himself, he had every right to assume his readers' familiarity with the Servian organization. This is, indeed, the clear implication of *quae descriptio si esset ignota vobis, explicaretur a me*. As has been demonstrated above (p. 138), these words can only mean that Scipio assumes on the part of his audience a knowledge of the Servian centuriate organization. In putting the words into Scipio's mouth, Cicero must clearly be making the same assumption about his own readers. And, in any case, he does not leave everything to memory, but supplies them with what, for his purpose, are the relevant details.

(c) Since there were, on any theory, differences between the Servian and the reformed *Comitia Centuriata*, it would, *prima facie*, be a curious proceeding on Cicero's part to give an account of the former in terms of the latter. The Mommsenian view justifies such a method on the ground that the differences were not significant. Now, if the differences between the two systems were limited in such a way that the statements Cicero wished to make applied indifferently to either of them, one might accept the justification as valid. But in fact the words of Cicero, as read and interpreted by Mommsen and those scholars who refer them to the reformed assembly, are not really compatible with that supposition. The Mommsenian view is that Cicero's language indicates the following differences between the Servian and the reformed *Comitia*. Instead of the 80 centuries assigned to it in the Servian system, the first class in the reformed assembly had only 70, while the lower classes had their total number of centuries correspondingly increased from 90 to 100. As a result, whereas in the Servian system the Equites and the first class, with a combined total of 98 centuries, held a clear majority, in the reformed assembly this was no longer the case, since, as Cicero himself is supposed to state, they now required, not only the vote of the century of *fabri tignarii*, but the votes of eight centuries from the lower classes as well, in order to obtain a

majority. The Mommsenian view thus results in the extraordinary paradox that Cicero, whose supposed design is to draw attention to the preponderance of the Equites and the first class in the *Comitia Centuriata* as established by Servius,⁵ deliberately refrains from citing the clear-cut figures afforded by the Servian *discriptio*, which gave these voters an absolute majority, and chooses instead to present figures, supposedly derived from the reformed organization, which considerably diminish the force of his argument. If in the reformed assembly the Equites and the first class did not command an absolute majority, then a fundamental principle of the Servian organization had been modified. It seems merely perverse on the part of adherents of the Mommsenian view to refuse to recognise this as a significant difference in relation to what they would hold to be Cicero's theme.

(d) The Mommsenian interpretation⁶ of *nunc rationem videtis esse talem ut . . .*, etc. is that Scipio (Cicero) hereby gives notice that he is going to refer to the "present-day" centuriate organization; because he is thought to give details involving differences from the Servian system, he cannot, it is believed, be referring to the Servian organization in what follows. But the clause *in quo . . . fuit diligens*, which immediately succeeds Scipio's analysis of the centuriation, is a serious difficulty for that interpretation. If *nunc* signalized a transference to the present, Cicero would be guilty of contradicting himself. After attributing the centuriation to the "present-day," reformed assembly, he would then proceed, with *in quo . . . fuit diligens*, to refer to it as belonging to the Servian organization. It is clear, then, that if *nunc* is taken in this purely temporal sense, Cicero has to be considered as implying something definitely untrue, namely that the centuriation in the Servian and in the reformed systems was identical.

A similar confusion would arise as a result of a later sentence in §40: *illarum autem sex et nonaginta centuriarum in una centuria tum quidem plures censebantur quam paene in prima classe tota*. The "ninety-six centuries" are, as *illarum* empha-

⁵ This is the usual view of Cicero's intention. I hope to show later that it is inexact: that Cicero is concerned only with the preponderance of the first class in the Servian system (pp. 148 ff.).

⁶ So also Fraccaro, *op. cit.*, pp. 111 ff., who to some extent recognizes the difficulty; cf. n. 3 above.

sizes, those which have already been referred to in the phrase *relicua multo maior multitudo sex et nonaginta centuriarum* in the part of §39 which, according to the Mommsenian view, analyses the "present-day" centuriate organization. But now, as is clear from *tum quidem . . . censebantur*, these 96 centuries are attributed unequivocally to the Servian organization. This can be reconciled with the Mommsenian theory only if the 96 centuries were a continuing feature of the *Comitia Centuriata*, present both in the Servian and in the reformed system. But this could not be the case. According to the Mommsenian view, the 96 centuries are an arithmetical abstraction: namely, the remainder of the 104 centuries of the lower classes, etc., in the reformed assembly, after 8 centuries have been subtracted to give the higher classes a majority. This calculation has no meaning at all for the Servian assembly, in which the lower classes, etc., did not have 104 centuries assigned to them, while the higher classes held a clear majority and did not require the assistance of any centuries from the lower classes. It is true that, according to Dionysius' figures for the Servian organization, the total number of centuries was 193, so that 96 would be the remainder of centuries not participating in the majority vote.⁷ But this is an entirely different calculation. Instead of being the remainder of the 104 centuries of the lower classes and supernumeraries (except the *fabri tignarii*) after the subtraction of 8 centuries, the 96 centuries in the Servian system would be the whole of the centuries of the lower classes and supernumeraries (including the *fabri tignarii*) with the addition, moreover, of one century of the Equites or the first class, since only 97 of their 98 centuries would be required for a majority. Apart from the fact that Livy appears not to agree with Dionysius about the Servian total, so that inference based on the Dionysian version is challengeable, it is hard to believe that Cicero would have applied the same phrase to two such different concepts, especially when the demonstrative *illarum* seems to establish without question the identity of sense in the two uses of *sex et nonaginta centuriarum*.⁸

⁷ Dion. Hal., IV, 18, 2, *al.* Livy's figures, and the question of the Servian total, are discussed below (p. 154).

⁸ *quidem* in *tum quidem . . . censebantur* might seem to lend support to the Mommsenian view by suggesting a contrast between the 96

Since the Mommsenian interpretation of *sex et nonaginta centuriarum* cannot be applied to the Servian system satisfactorily, and yet the 96 centuries are certainly represented by Cicero as a feature of the Servian system, there cannot be much doubt that the Mommsenian interpretation is incorrect. And since it is impossible to apply the arithmetical calculation of which the 96 centuries form a part to both forms of the centuriate organization indifferently,⁹ and yet the calculation has to apply to the Servian system, the 96 centuries referred to by Cicero cannot be a feature of the reformed assembly. Therefore, the reference to them in the clause *nunc rationem videtis . . .*, etc. conclusively proves that this clause does not refer to the reformed, but to the Servian centuriate organization.

Unless, then, we are to suppose that Cicero (a) was guilty of an unintelligent perversion of the historical facts, (b) inexplicably failed to develop his theme in the natural way, (c) with-

centuries of the past and those of the present. But this interpretation is open to the general objections already indicated. Either it implies a continuity of "the 96 centuries" from the Servian to the reformed organization: which is not possible. Or it implies a covert admission by Cicero that when he mentioned the 96 centuries the first time, he was not actually referring to centuries of the Servian assembly, although he purported to be doing so; and this hopping backwards and forwards between the Servian and the contemporary organization would be an objectionable and improbable procedure, since the two organizations were not interchangeable.

It is evidently necessary to give an interpretation of *tum quidem* that does not make it imply a contrast between the Servian and the reformed organization. This can be done without strain. When Cicero says that more were registered by the census *in una centuria* of the 96 than in almost the whole of the first class, he is clearly thinking of the century of the *proletarii* (whom he has just mentioned); Dionysius (IV, 21, 1) makes a similar point. The contrast Cicero implies by *tum quidem* must be between the original ratio of *proletarii* to first class (*tum*, i.e. in Servius' day) and a changed ratio brought about by economic changes in later (but pre-reform) times, which may well, with increasing prosperity, have seen a relative increase in membership of the first census class and decrease in the number of people with a proletarian rating.

* This must necessarily be true, whatever view of the reform be taken, since the total of centuries in the first class of the reformed assembly could not be the same as in the Servian organization; 80 centuries could not be fitted into a system based on 35 tribes. So the arithmetic of the majority is bound to be different in the two organizations.

out justification ignored an important difference between the Servian and the reformed *Comitia Centuriata*, and (d) set forth the data in a most confused and contradictory manner (in which case his evidence would surely be of dubious value anyhow)—the conclusion is inescapable that in the passage *nunc rationem videtis . . .*, etc., Cicero is doing what, in the context, we may reasonably expect him to be doing, namely, analysing certain significant aspects of the Servian centuriate organization.¹⁰

We seem to be faced with a dilemma. Scipio's analysis has to apply throughout to the Servian centuriate organization. But the accepted text based on V²'s corrections will not permit this. V²'s figure for the centuries of the first class is 10 less than the figure given by the annalistic tradition represented by Livy and Dionysius; and the figures for the other classes must be correspondingly disturbed. One might perhaps make the supposition that Cicero really did give different figures. But since Livy and Dionysius, though differing on some other points, are unanimous on the class totals and afford no hint of another tradition, we should have to suppose also that Cicero's figures were erroneous; and on general grounds it seems better to avoid making such a supposition. The obvious solution is to refuse to accept V²'s text.

Against adopting such a solution it is commonly argued that V² must have had independent manuscript authority for his emendations since they display unusual learning in regard to the existence of the *sex suffragia*. This argument contains not merely one assumption, but two: not only the hypothesis that V² had access to another MS, with which to compare V¹'s text,

¹⁰ There is of course no difficulty about the Latin of the actual phrase in question, which lends itself to a natural interpretation on such lines: *nunc* is to be understood, not in a purely temporal sense, but in its common logical sense (= *νῦν δέ*), and is to be taken with the main clause (*videtis*), not with *esse*. The sense is: "if that *discriptio* were unknown to you, I should expound it (i. e. in detail); but, as it is, you perceive the *ratio* to be such that . . . (etc.)." Of course, too, the present tense of *esse* requires no more defence in such a context than "to be" does in the English version; the *ratio*, though relating to a thing of the past, is the subject of present consideration, and the present infinitive, especially in view of its capacity to embrace the imperfect tense, is natural; and just as naturally Cicero is able to move into tenses of the past in the following subordinate clauses.

but the assumption that V², whoever he may have been, was not a person of sufficient learning to be able to emend the corrupt text by introducing a reference to the *sex suffragia*. Since, however, we have no evidence as to the identity of V², we could just as well make the hypothesis that he was not a mere scribe, but a man of antiquarian interests, whose corrections were those of a reader trying to make sense of the corrupt text before him. The MS is considered to be of early date, of the fourth or the fifth century, so that the postulation of such antiquarian knowledge on V²'s part is not necessarily far-fetched. Alternatively, even if we accept the hypothesis that V² had access to another MS, we are still not forced to accept V²'s corrections in this passage. The other MS need not necessarily have given V² any help in making his corrections here, so that he would have to use the light of his own reason; or else, the text having previously become corrupt, the other MS might have contained the result of corrections made earlier by some possessor of antiquarian knowledge. The fact is, that whether we suppose the corrections to emanate from V² himself or from an earlier source, we still have to reject them *because they make Cicero write nonsense*.¹¹

The principles which the emender will have followed are not hard to discern. He would be able to work for the most part from the text as seen in V¹'s version. In the first place, he took *relicua multo maior multitudo* to refer to the minority of centuries remaining after eight centuries (*octo solae si accesserunt*) had been deducted from the lower classes to give a majority.¹² So

¹¹ It is interesting to note that D. M. Lewis in a paper, "Ithome Again," *Historia*, II (1953/4), pp. 412 ff., was moved to make a similar suggestion with regard to the text of Thucydides, I, 103, 1. He discusses at some length the possibility that Thucydides' text was "corrected" in order to bring it into line with the "official" version, that of Ephorus, and suggests that similar considerations might be relevant to the problem of the Thucydidean text at II, 13, 3.

In the case of Cicero, the text has, in my view, been "emended" to make sense of it, and a piece of antiquarian knowledge has been brought in from another source to help with the emendation. I do not discuss the possibility that the text has been emended to give the "official" (actually Dionysius') total of centuries, because I find that the emender could have produced his results by using the data supplied by V¹'s text (and misinterpreting them).

¹² I hope to show a little later (pp. 148 ff.) that this assumption, which, indeed, has to be made by the interpreters of V²'s text, is mistaken,

this remainder, i.e. the minority, totalled 96 centuries, and therefore the majority was 97. He took *tot enim relicuae sunt* as referring to the remainder of all the centuries after those of the Equites, first class, and *fabri tignarii* had been considered apart: in other words, the total of the centuries of the lower classes before the deduction of the eight centuries. This gave him the equation: $x - 8 = 96$. So he inserted before *tot enim relicuae* the appropriate figure: *ex centum quattuor centuriis*. He had still to account for the first part of the sentence (*equitum . . . centurias*), which was now left high and dry. He took this as another equation: Equites + first class + *fabri tignarii* = y centuries. On this assumption the solution of y was evidently his majority figure, 97, minus the added 8 centuries. To V's *VIII centurias* he therefore added *LXXX . . . habeat*. As he had now bisected the sentence, he had to provide a connection between its two halves. This was done with the connecting relative *quibus*. There remained the first words of the clause. Here he had to call on resources beyond the text itself, though the alteration of *certamine* to *centuriae* was fatally obvious. His treatment of *cum et suffragiis* must have been governed by the knowledge that certain equestrian centuries were sometimes referred to as *sex suffragia*, a fact known to us from an article in Festus, and perhaps known to the emender from the same or a related source.¹³

since it entails, within the very clause containing the phrase, the possibility of a contradiction.

¹³ Festus, p. 452 L: *sex suffragia appellantur in equitum centuriis quae sunt adiectae* (MS *adfectae*) *ei numero centuriarum quas Priscus Tarquinius rex constituit*. The passage is notoriously difficult. J. H. Oliver, "Festus on the Sex Suffragia," *Studi in onore di P. de Francisci*, I (1954), pp. 129 f., would retain the manuscript reading *adfectae*. He draws attention to Cicero, *Topica*, II, 8, where *adfectae sunt ad* appears to mean something like "are closely connected with," and considers this sense applicable in the Festus passage, which he translates: "The so-called sex suffragia are among the equestrian centuries those centuries which correspond to that group of centuries which king Tarquinius Priscus established." However, there seems some difficulty in progressing from "are closely connected with" to "correspond to," as the latter expression implies a kind of identity and the former does not. If "are closely connected with" is substituted for "correspond to" in the translation, the sense is not so satisfactory; the idea that the *sex*

In tracing the principles on which the emender reconstructed the text, it was suggested that his basic assumption was that *relicua multo maior multitudo sex et nonaginta centuriarum* designated the minority of centuries when 8 had been detached from the lower class centuries to make a majority. This assump-

suffragia are the same as (in the sense of descendent from) Tarquinius' six centuries is not thereby conveyed.

If we retain the long-established emendation *adiectae*, a possible explanation of the difficulty is that Festus has expressed himself confusedly in the process of compressing an article, perhaps from Verrius Flaccus, which contained the information (a) that *sex suffragia* was a name for the centuries established by Tarquinius Priscus (cf. Livy, I, 36, 7-8), and (b) that the rest of the equestrian centuries were "additional to that number" (cf. Livy, I, 43, 8-9). Festus probably meant *quae . . . centuriarum* to be taken as a parenthesis: "*sex suffragia* is the name for those among the equestrian centuries (which were added to that number of centuries) which king Tarquinius Priscus established." If so, Festus failed to realise that the form of the expression was illogical—he would appear to say that the equestrian centuries were added to a part of themselves. But this is at least understandable if he was merely summarizing. (This is in effect a refinement on Lindsay's interpretation; instead of making *quae . . . centuriarum* a parenthesis, he puts a semicolon after *centuriarum*. See H. Hill, *The Roman Middle Class* [1952], pp. 208-10, with reference to an earlier article in *A. J. P.*, LVIII [1937], pp. 458 f.).

Livy, XLIII, 16, 14-16 (*cum ex duodecim centuriis equitum octo censorem condemnassent multaeque aliae primae classis . . .*, etc.) and Cicero, *Phil.*, II, 33, 82 (*sortitio praerogativae: quiescit. renuntiatur: tacet. prima classis vocatur, renuntiatur: deinde ita ut adsolet suffragia, tum secunda classis: quae omnia sunt citius facta quam dixi. confecto negotio . . .*, etc.), are generally held to indicate that in the reformed assembly the equestrian centuries were divided so that 12 voted with the first class while the *sex suffragia* voted between the first and the second class (cf. Mommsen, *Staatsr.*, III, p. 292; *Dr. Pub.*, VI, 1, p. 331; C. Meier, *s.v. Praerogativa Centuria*, *R.-E.*, Suppl. VIII [1956], cols. 567 ff., esp. 574). This view rests in part on what is probably a misinterpretation of Livy's phrase *multaeque aliae primae classis*. In accordance with the idiomatic usage of *alius*, the phrase would be better construed as "and many *also* of the first class" than as "and many others of the first class." This knocks away the support of Livy for the view that any equestrian centuries were combined with those of the first class. (And Dion. Hal., X, 17, which is sometimes cited, seems quite irrelevant.) As for the Ciceronian passage, if *suffragia* is supposed to be technical jargon for *sex suffragia*, we then miss a reference to the other twelve equestrian centuries. Even if they did vote in with the first class, it would surely be extraordinary if

tion is demonstrably invalid. Cicero states that, under the conditions postulated, "the remaining . . . multitude" was not excluded from the voting (*suffragiis*—not merely *iure suffragii*). But the nature of voting at Rome was such that when a majority had been reached, the casting of votes ceased. Therefore, in the

Cicero really had failed to allude to them, as he could easily have done in some such phrase as *prima classis cum equitibus*. Surely a far better solution would be to assume that, as *sex suffragia* was a name for six of the equestrian centuries (also, however, referred to as *sex centuriae*: cf. Livy, I, 36, 8 *quas nunc . . . sex vocant centurias*), so *suffragia* came to be used as technical jargon for the equestrian centuries as a whole. Then the missing reference in Cicero, *Phil.*, II, 33, 82 to the equestrian centuries presents no problem. In that case, Cicero, far from supplying indirect evidence for combination of Equites and first class, would afford direct evidence that, by 44 B. C. at least, all the equestrian centuries voted after and separately from the first class. Livy, XLIII, 16, 14-16 refers to only twelve equestrian centuries. This problem might be resolved by emendation: for example, *ex XII . . . VIII* could be a corruption of *ex XVIII . . . XII*. On the other hand, there is no necessity to accept the usual interpretation of the existing text; a perfectly natural, and, I think, preferable interpretation of it will allow for eighteen equestrian centuries voting together. There is no compelling reason to assume that Livy is listing the actual order of voting when he puts the equestrian centuries before the first class. (Cicero, by contrast, in *Phil.*, II, 33, 82, is explicitly detailing the order of voting.) Livy probably mentions the equestrian centuries first simply because their vote against the censor was especially noteworthy. The fact that, at least by the time of the Second Punic War (cf. Livy, XXIV, 7, 12, *al.*), the *centuria praerogativa* was drawn from the first class may reasonably be taken as indication that by this time the equestrian centuries had lost the priority in the voting attributed to them in the accounts of the Servian system: especially as, in Livy, XXVII, 6, 3, the (*centuriae*) *iure vocatae*, which appear to be the centuries of the first class summoned to the vote by tribes (cf. Livy, V, 18, 2: *iure vocatae tribus*; Mommsen, *Staatsr.*, III, p. 290, n. 3; p. 294, n. 1; *Dr. Pub.*, VI, 1, p. 330, n. 1; p. 333, n. 5), are found voting immediately after the *centuria praerogativa*. (C. Meier's notion, *op. cit.*, cols. 572 f., 583, that the *centuria praerogativa* may by this time have been taken from a combination of the twelve equestrian centuries with the first class is surely untenable in face of the clear evidence of Cic., *pro Planc.*, 20, 49; there the *centuria praerogativa* is designated as *unius tribus pars* when the reference is not to a specific century, but to the *centuria praerogativa* considered generally and in abstract; this surely excludes any equestrian centuries; cf. also Plutarch, *Cato Min.*, 42, 4: ἡ τε πρώτη κληθεῖσα τῶν φυλῶν). We have therefore adequate grounds for believing that for a considerable time before the date of the incident referred to

not unlikely event of a unanimous vote by the first 97 centuries, "the remaining . . . multitude of 96 centuries" would in fact be *wholly excluded from the voting*. The difficulty is caused by the fact that the 8 centuries, which are included, and which obviously constitute the justification of Cicero's assertion, are not allowed by V's text, and its inevitable interpretation, to be a part of the *relicua multitudo*. If the balance of votes in the assembly were really such as V's text represents it, Cicero would only be justified in saying that the 104 centuries of the lower classes were not excluded from the voting (because 8 of them were needed for a majority).

These considerations lead to a conclusion of great significance for the interpretation of the whole passage. The phrase *relicua*

by Livy (169 B.C.), the equestrian centuries as a whole had been voting after the first class. In view of this, the phrase *ex duodecim centuriis equitum octo* should be interpreted, not as "eight of the twelve equestrian centuries," but as "eight out of twelve centuries of the Equites." Thus, to take a general view of the whole context, when the first class had voted heavily for condemnation of the censor, and when 12 of the equestrian centuries had proceeded to the vote, also with a majority for condemnation, the *principes civitatis* became desperately anxious, and, before the equestrian voting was over, hastened to make their dramatic appeal to the rest of the voters on the censor's behalf. This would actually be consonant with the commonly accepted view that the six unmentioned centuries were the *sex suffragia*. These, being the most ancient and distinguished of the centuries, may have incorporated the votes of the senators (cf. Cicero, *De R. P.*, IV, 2, . . . *equitatus in quo suffragia sunt etiam senatus*; Hill, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 ff., 208 ff.) and so of the *principes* themselves,—certainly of the patricians among them. Their appeal would be rendered the more effective if followed up by a solid vote of the *sex suffragia* in favour of the censor.

The *sex suffragia*, then, may be regarded as a distinct, but not a detached, element of the 18 equestrian centuries. There was no especial reason for Cicero to mention them when discussing the balance of votes in the *Comitia Centuriata*. Indeed, it would appear somewhat strange that he should go out of his way to refer to the *sex suffragia* in this context, and yet should not mention until two books later (*De R. P.*, IV, 2) the *plebiscitum reddendorum equorum* of 129 B.C. which appears to have had the effect of excluding the senators from the equestrian centuries and so, presumably, from the *sex suffragia* (cf. Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand* [1927], pp. 1 ff.). After the passing of this measure there would be less reason than before for paying attention to the ancient distinction between the six and the twelve centuries of the Equites.

... *multitudo* does not mean "the remainder after the subtraction of 8 centuries," but simply "the remaining multitude" (including the 8 centuries) as contrasted with the higher classes previously mentioned, especially the first class. This is confirmed in §40 when *illarum sex et nonaginta centuriarum* (i.e. the *relicua multitudo*) is placed in contrast with *prima classe*. In other words, Cicero's 96 centuries are the centuries of the classes below the first. So when he speaks of the 8 centuries added to make up a majority, he does not mean 8 over and above the 96 centuries, but 8 *from* the 96. It then becomes universally true that the 96 centuries were not excluded from the voting, since 8 of their number had to be included in the majority vote.

This conclusion points the way to a revised interpretation of the arithmetic of the passage. The basis of Cicero's calculations is, not that $(104 - 8)$ is less by 1 than $(89 + 8)$, but that $(96 - 8)$ is less by 1 than $(81 + 8)$. There can be no doubt as to the significance of the figure 81 in terms of centuries. The odd century being that of the *fabri tignarii*, the other 80 are the centuries of the first class in the Servian system. This calculation would be represented in the text if, ignoring V²'s supplement (*habeat . . . centuriis*), we read *ad LXXXI centurias—tot enim relicuae sunt—octo solae si accesserunt* in place of V¹'s *VIII centurias . . .*, etc.¹⁴ The parenthetical *tot enim relicuae sunt* is now seen to refer to these 81 centuries of the first class and *fabri tignarii*. The meaning implied is clearly—"81 are left of the centuries of the higher classes." And the implication of this must be that in the first words of the *ut* clause, the equestrian centuries have been exempted from the calculation in some way.

That Cicero's arithmetic should take this form need cause no surprise if the whole of §39 is brought into consideration. Scipio says that Servius "after separating off a large body of *Equites* from the total sum of the people, divided the rest of the people into five classes, distinguished seniors from juniors, and demarcated them (*the classes*) in such a way that the voting was in the power of the rich, not the multitude, and saw to it . . .

¹⁴ It is conceivable, perhaps, that corruption of the numeral might have come about through abbreviation of *octoginta unam* to *octo unam* (especially with *octo solae* following), this expression then being rationalized into *novem* or *VIII*.

that the 'most' should not be the most powerful." It is clear, then, that Scipio is paying special attention to the fact that, even within the five classes, the rich, i. e. the first class, had a striking preponderance of power vis-à-vis "the remaining much greater multitude." The *discriptio* referred to in the next sentence is the *discriptio* of the five classes; the centuriation of the Equites had already been dealt with in the sentence of which *duodeviginti censu maximo* is the surviving fragment. But *nunc rationem videtis . . .*, etc. purports to introduce an analysis of this *discriptio*. Therefore it is only to be expected that attention will be confined to the five classes and that the equestrian centuries will somehow be eliminated from consideration.

Before attempting to apply this conclusion further to V's text, it may be noted that, with the removal of V²'s supplements, it becomes possible to regard the whole passage from *nunc* to *periculosum* as a complete sentence. Syntactical irregularity is easily avoided by the correction of *confecta est* to *confecta esset*, so that there are three verbs governed by the consecutive construction introduced by *ut*; this affords a more satisfactory explanation of the subjunctives *excluderetur* and *valeret* than is possible with V²'s text. It is also an improvement that the consecutive clause is no longer broken off at *habeat*, since at that stage the account of the *ratio* is far from complete.

The phrase in which the exclusion of the equestrian centuries from the calculation is signalized forms the most corrupt part of V's text, and emendation must necessarily be speculative. The text is:

ut equitum certamine cum et suffragiis et prima classis . . .

The nominative *prima classis* has no function in the sentence. It is only a slight change to the genitive *primae classis*, dependent on *suffragiis*; then *et* is used in the sense of *etiam*. The sense given is: (eliminating the equestrian centuries from calculations) "by the votes even of the first class, with the century of *fabri tignarii*, if to their 81 centuries (for that is the number remaining of the higher class centuries) only 8 were added, the whole of the mighty will of the people was effected. . . ." With regard to the exclusion of the Equites, the word *certamine*, the facile emendation of which has seemed to many a particularly unsatisfactory feature of V²'s textual changes, appears in fact to

have an important function. Contention among the Equites, resulting in an evenly divided vote, would be the most convenient hypothesis for Cicero's purpose of ruling them out of calculations. The required sense could be given by

ut *aequatis* equitum certamine *suffragiis*, tamen *suffragiis*
¹⁵

The complete text, incorporating the suggested emendations, now becomes:

nunc rationem videtis esse talem ut *aequatis* equitum certamine *suffragiis*, tamen *suffragiis* et primae classis, addita centuria quae ad summum usum urbis fabris tignariis est data, ad LXXXI centurias (tot enim relicuae sunt) octo solae si accesserunt, confecta esset vis populi universa, relicuaeque multo maior multitudo sex et nonaginta centuriarum neque excluderetur *suffragiis* ne superbum esset, nec valeret nimis ne esset periculosum.

"But, as it is, you perceive the system to be such that, even though the votes of the Equites should be equalized through contention among them, nevertheless even by the votes of the first class, with the addition of the century which to the great advantage of the city was granted to the *fabri tignarii*, if to their 81 centuries (that being the number of the remainder) only eight were added, the whole of the mighty will of the people was effected, and the remaining much greater multitude in 96 centuries was neither excluded from the voting, lest that should be too disdainful, nor given too much power, lest that should prove dangerous."

The detailed implications of the argument may be represented as follows:—Even if the equestrian part of the higher class vote cancelled out, 9 centuries voting one way and 9 the other, nevertheless the preponderance of the rich remained; for the 81 votes

¹⁵ L. Lange, in *Rh. Mus.*, N. F. VIII (1853), pp. 616 ff., had already proposed to read *aequato equitum certamine*, offering parallels from Livy, XXIX, 34: *aequaverant certamen*; I, 25: *aequato Marte*; Lucretius, II, 573: *aequo geritur certamine principiorum*. This could be adapted to my text by omission of *suffragiis* which I consider to have been lost through haplography. I do not think it necessary to consider the rest of Lange's text, which is open to fairly obvious objections. (He read: *cum esset suffragiis IX, prima classis addita, centuriae octo solae si accesserunt, confecta esset*. . . .)

of the first class and *fabri tignarii* (*plus*, of course, the appropriate half of the equestrian vote), with the addition of only 8 votes from the lower classes (total, 98), were sufficient to secure a majority over the 96 lower class centuries less the eight centuries (and *plus*, of course, the other nine equestrian centuries) (total, 97).

It may be suggested that the hypothesis of an equalization of the equestrian vote is somewhat unreal. On the other hand, it was undoubtedly a most effective method whereby Cicero could concentrate attention on the special position which the first class enjoyed in the Servian organization by virtue of the disproportionate number of centuries allotted to it.

It results from the foregoing interpretation of Cicero's calculations that his total for the number of centuries in the Servian *Comitia Centuriata* is found to be 195. Dionysius, on the other hand, gives 193 as the total. Livy does not explicitly mention a total, and there is a difficulty about working one out from his detailed figures for the classes, because of a dispute concerning the correct interpretation of *in his accensi cornicines tubicinesque in tres centurias distributi* (I, 43, 7). Some editors omit *in* here and change *tres* to *duas* without MSS authority, on the dubious ground that Livy should be made to conform with Dionysius. With the text as it stands, *in his* might be interpreted so that 3 centuries of *accensi* and musicians were incorporated in the total of 30 centuries of the fifth class; in which case Livy's grand total would be 191. But it is more probable that the three were additional centuries *counted in with* the fifth class centuries;¹⁶ then the total number of centuries mentioned by Livy would be 194.

The discrepancies in the totals are entirely due to discrepancies about the supernumerary centuries. Livy has two centuries of *fabri* added to the first class, and three of *accensi* and musicians added to the fifth. Dionysius attaches two centuries of *fabri* (χειρορέχων) to the second class, and two of musicians to the fourth; he fails to mention the *accensi*. Cicero cites only one century of *fabri*, which he says was added to the first class. But by calling them *tignarii* (cf. Dionysius' τέκτρονες), he seems to imply the existence of another century of *fabri aerarii* (Dio-

¹⁶ Cf. Mommsen, *Staatsr.*, III, p. 282, n. 4; *Dr. Pub.*, VI, 1, 320, n. 3.

nysius' ὁπλοποιοί).¹⁷ Perhaps this was added to the second class in his version; that might account for the discrepancy between Livy and Dionysius, and also for Dionysius' strange notion that the artisan centuries were divided according to age, so that one voted after the *seniores* of the second class and the other after the *iuniores*. It should be remembered that Cicero is not setting out to give a detailed account of the *Comitia Centuriata*, and so had no call to mention the other century of *fabri*, which happened not to be relevant to his purpose. He refers incidentally to a further four centuries in *quin etiam accensis velatis, liticini-bus, cornicinibus, proletariis* . . . , thus confirming Livy's century of *accensi*.¹⁸ His figure of 96 centuries for the *relicua multitudo* evidently implies the existence of 6 supernumerary centuries in this group (the *fabri tignarii* not being included), of which 5 are now accounted for. The remaining century could be identified with the *ni quis scivit centuria* referred to by Festus.¹⁹ We thereby obtain virtual agreement between Livy and Cicero concerning the total of centuries. Livy, in detailing the centuriation of the classes and supernumeraries from the point of view of the Servian census, had no occasion to refer to this century which was unconnected with the census and was in fact merely a voting arrangement for the convenience of late voters. Cicero, while not needing to refer to the century, was bound to take account of it, by implication, when making computations connected with the total number of voting centuries, which it completed. The figure 195 is, indeed, more attractive in itself than Dionysius' figure. It would indicate a voting system deliberately ordered so that the Equites and the first class together were assured of the bare majority (98 to 97), and it

¹⁷ Dion. Hal., IV, 17, 3: cf. Mommsen, *Staatsr.*, III, p. 282; p. 287, n. 3; *Dr. Pub.*, VI, 1, p. 320; p. 325, n. 2.

¹⁸ Cf. P. Fraccaro, "Accensi" in *Athenaeum*, V (1927), pp. 133 ff.

¹⁹ P. 184 L.: *ni quis scivit centuria est quae dicitur a Ser. Tulio rege constituta, in qua liceret ei suffragium ferre qui non tulisset in sua, ne quis civis suffragii iure privaretur . . . Sed in ea centuria neque censetur quisquam neque centurio praeficitur neque centurialis potest esse, quia nemo certus est eius centuriae*. There seems no justification for denying the existence of this century. The second sentence quoted strongly suggests that the century was a phenomenon still to be observed, if not in Festus' own day, at least at the time when his source wrote, so probably in the first century B. C. (whether it was Varro or Verrius Flaccus).

avoids the consequence of Dionysius' system that the vote of the last century of the first class would frequently not be required.

The main results of this discussion are, then: (1) that Cicero in *De Re Publica*, II, 22, 39-40 should be interpreted as referring throughout to the Servian centuriate organization; and (2) that the account of that organization followed by him is probably not very different from the annalistic, and in particular the Livian, account. I think I am justified in maintaining that the case I have made out for these conclusions will stand independently of my detailed proposals for textual emendation, since I have endeavoured to elicit the logic of Cicero's thought, in the first instance, from the uncontaminated portions of his text.

G. V. SUMNER.

UNIVERSITY OF CANTERBURY,
CHRISTCHURCH, NEW ZEALAND.

FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS OF AURELIA TITOUAIS.¹

The financial transactions of a certain Aurelia Titouais, daughter of Hatres, mother's name Tapaeis, of the village of Karanis have been made known to scholars within the past twenty-eight years by the publication of three papyri in three collections in three different countries, two European, one American.² These papyri—along with the three papyri published in this article—have been known to derive from purchase through a consortium of institutions (and one individual, Mr. Wilfred

¹ The following short-titles will be employed for some of the more commonly cited works in this article: Evelyn-White = H. G. Evelyn-White, *The Monasteries of the Wadi 'n Natrun, Part II: The History of the Monasteries of Nitra and Scetis* (New York, 1932); Hardy, *Christian Egypt* = E. R. Hardy, *Christian Egypt: Church and People* (New York, 1952); Johnson and West, *Byzantine Egypt* = A. C. Johnson and L. C. West, *Byzantine Egypt: Economic Studies* (Princeton, 1949); Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen* = S. G. Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen zu einer Grammatik der Papyri der nachchristlichen Zeit* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, XXVIII [Munich, 1938]); Mayser, *Grammatik* = E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Revised edition, 2 vols. in 6 [Leipzig and Berlin, 1923-38]); Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien* = A. Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien* (325-395) (Vol. IV, Part II of G. Glotz, *Histoire Romaine* [Paris, 1947]).

References to papyrological publications will conform to the citations in Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*,⁹ pp. xliii-xlv. One work which does not appear there will be cited by short-title in this article, as follows: Preisigke, *Namenbuch* = F. Preisigke, *Namenbuch enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen, ägyptischen, hebräischen, arabischen, und sonstigen semitischen und nicht-semitischen Menschen-namen, soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden (Papyri, Ostraka, Mumien-schildern usw.) Ägyptens sich vorfinden* (Heidelberg, 1922).

² These three papyri are (1) *P. Osl.*, II, 38 (Karanis, 374 A.D. or 375 A.D.). An excellent new version of this papyrus, suggested by the second papyrus in this list (*P. Merton*, 37), is given by H. C. Youtie, "Critical Notes on Greek Papyri," in *T. A. P. A.*, LXXXIII (1952), pp. 100-19, especially pp. 116-19. (2) *P. Merton*, 37 (Arsinoite nome, 373 A.D.). (3) *P. NYU*, Inv. No. xvi (Karanis, 373 A.D.), published by N. Lewis, "An Aurelia Tetouais Archive?," in *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*, II (Milan, 1957), pp. 321-3.

Merton) in 1924. Since they all derive from the same purchase, and since, moreover, they came in association with documents belonging to the archive of Aurelius Isidorus, the question has been raised whether there is an Aurelia Titoueis archive or whether the documents mentioning her name form a part of the Aurelius Isidorus archive.³ The three Columbia papyri that are published below are presented with the hope that they may contribute something to the solution of these questions and that they may encourage the publication of other Aurelia Titoueis papyri, if they should be found in other collections. For the present, it will suffice to say that, in view of the time-span of almost fifty years which exists between the latest Isidorus documents and the earliest known Titoueis documents,⁴ it seems most unlikely that the Titoueis documents belong to the Isidorus archive.

P. Col., Inv. No. 59

February 3 (?), 372 A. D.

25.9 cm. × 10 cm.

Αὐρηλία Τιτούεις Ἀτρῇ ἀπὸ κώ-
 μης Κερανίδος τοῦ Ἀρσινοΐτου
 νομοῦ Αὐρηλία Κοντίνου
 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀρσινοΐτῶν πόλεως
 5 χέρειν.
 ὡμολογῶ ἐσχηκαίνει καὶ με-
 μαιτρῆσθαι παρὰ σοῦ σίτον σὺν
 ἡμωλίας ἀρτάβας ἐννῆα (ἀρτάβαι) θ
 καὶ ἀργυρίου Σεβαστοῦ νομίσμα-
 10 τος ταλάντων τρισχιλίων (τάλαντα), Γ
 ὧντων εἰς τιμὴν κριθῆς ἀρτα-
 βῶν ἕξ (ἀρτάβαι) ἡ ὥσπερ σὺ ἀποδώ-
 σο {σοί}, τὰ πάντα, μηνὶ Ἐπιφ τῆς
 εὐτυχῆς βς ἰνδικτίωνος ἀνυ-
 15 περθέτος καὶ ἀνεν πάσης ἀντι-
 λογίας τῆς πράξεως περιγ<ι>νω-
 μένης ἔκ τε ἐμοῦ ἢ καὶ ἐκ τῶν

³ By N. Lewis, in the article cited in footnote 2, above.

⁴ The year 324 A. D. is given as the date of the latest documents in the Isidorus archive by A. E. R. Boak, "An Egyptian Farmer of the Age of Diocletian and Constantine," in *Byzantina Metabyzantina*, I, i (1946), pp. 39-53, especially p. 53. A complete edition of the Michigan and Cairo documents from the archive, by Professors A. E. R. Boak and H. C. Youtie, of the University of Michigan, is now in press. For the moment, I may cite the detailed list of published items from the archive that is given by A. Bataille, *Les Papyrus* (being P. Lemerle, *Traité d'études Byzantines*, Vol. II [Paris, 1955]), p. 24.

- ὑπαρχόντων μου πάντων
 παντῶν εἰδὼν πράσσοντι σοὶ
 20 καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθεῖσα) ὁμω-
 λόγησα. ὑπατίας Δωμετίου
 Μωδέστου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρ-
 χου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πρετορίου καὶ Φλ(αοῦ)ίου)
 Ἀρινθέου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου κόμμε-
 25 τος καὶ μαγίστρου τῆς πεδικῆς δυνά-
 μ[ε]ος Μεχὶρ θ. Αὐρηλία Τιτούεις
 ἡ προκιμένη ἔσχον τὰς τοῦ σίτου
 ἀρτάβας ἐννέα (ἀρτάβαι) θ καὶ τὰς τῆς κρι(θῆς)
 ἀρτάβας ἑξ (ἀρτάβαι) ς καὶ ἀποδώσω πρ[ο-
 30 θ]εσμία ὅς πρ[ό]κιτε. Αὐρήλιος Πέ-
 τρος Νεμεσιανοῦ ἔγραψα ὑ-
 πὲρ αὐτῆς γρά(μματα) μὴ εἰδ(νίας).

Verso:

X(ειρόγραφον) Τιτούεις ἀπὸ κόμης Καρανίδος σίτου (ἀρτάβαι) θ
 καὶ κριθῆς.

2. 1. Καρανίδος. 5. 1. χαίρειν. 6. 1. ὁμολογῶ. 1. ἐσχηκέναι. 6-7. 1.
 μεμετρῆσθαι. 8. 1. ἡμιολίας (for ἡμιολία). 1. ἐννέα. 10. 1. ταλάντων.
 11. 1. ὄντων. 12. 1. σοὶ. 12-3. 1. ἀποδώσω. 13. 1. Ἐπεὶφ. 14. 1.
 εὐτυχούς. 1. ἰνδικτίονος. 14-5. 1. ἀνπερθέτως. 16-7. 1. περιγυνομένης.
 17. 1. τῶν. 18. 1. ὑπαρχόντων. 1. πάντων. 19. 1. παντοίων εἰδῶν.
 20-1. 1. ὁμολόγησα. 21. 1. ὑπατείας. 1. Δομιτίου. 22. 1. Μωδέστου.
 23. 1. πραιτωρίου. 24. 1. Ἀρινθαίου. 24-5. 1. κόμητος. 25-6. 1. δυνάμεως.
 26. 1. Μεχέρ. 27. 1. προκειμένη. 28. 1. ἐννέα. 29. 1. ἀποδώσω. 30. 1.
 ὡς πρόκειται.

NOTES

3. Κουτίον: For feminine names in -ον in the papyri, see Mayser, *Grammatik*, II, i, pp. 31-2. Aside from the vocative, the other cases of these names are treated as feminines. See E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, II (Munich, 1950), p. 37. The termination -ον instead of -ω is to be explained not merely by the frequent interchange between ο(ω) and ου and ου and ο(ω) in the papyri (for which, see Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen*, p. 117; Mayser, *Grammatik*, I, i, pp. 99-100, 116-17), but also by the gradual replacement, in late Greek, of the dative by the genitive (for which, see J. Humbert, *La Disparition du datif en Grec* [Paris, 1930], pp. 168-71).

9-10. ἀργυρίου Σεβαστοῦ νομίματος: L. C. West and A. C.

Johnson, *Currency in Roman and Byzantine Egypt* (Princeton, 1944), p. 67, counted "at least eight instances" of "Augustan (imperial) silver" in papyri of dates which range from 235 A. D. to 305 A. D.

11. *εἰς τιμήν*: F. Pringsheim, *The Greek Law of Sale* (Weimar, 1950), p. 280, construes this phrase "not as a price, but for the price." A common meaning in later Greek is "as the price." See F. Blass-A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*⁹ (Göttingen, 1954), §157, 5; W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1957), s. v. *εἰς*, 8.

14. The second indiction here is 372/3 A. D.

25-6. *μαγίστρον τῆς πεδικῆς δυνάμεως*: This part of the title of the *magister militum*—which appears also in *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 181 (28), 3-4, and No. 181 (30), 4-5—has, to our knowledge, not hitherto been attested. For the titulature of this office, see W. Ensslin, "Zum Heermeisteramt des spätrömischen Reiches, II: Die Titulatur der *magistri militum* bis auf Theodosius I," in *Klio*, XXIII, Neue Folge V (1930), pp. 306-25, especially pp. 309-12, 323; cf. Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien*, pp. 331-2. (There is no need here to consider specifically the *magistri militum praesentales*, who were investigated by A. Hoepfner, "Les 'magistri militum praesentales' au IV^e siècle," in *Byzantion*, XI [1936], pp. 483-98.) Up to the time of Theodosius, the *magister militum* was frequently designated as *magister equitum et (ac) peditum*. The Greek translation of *magister* was *στρατηλάτης* or *στρατηγός*, but a half-Latin version of Arinthaëus' title, *μάγιστρος τῶν στρατιωτῶν* appears in *B. G. U.*, IV, 1092, 3, and *P. Lips.*, I, 85, 3 (as read in *Berichtigungsliste*, I, p. 212). While the *πεδικὴ δύναμις* in the three Columbia papyri could satisfactorily translate the Latin *pedestris militia*, under the Ptolemies already, it is to be observed, *πεζικαὶ* (and *ἵππικαὶ*) *δυνάμεις* had been employed in official terminology. See Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, III, p. 217, s. v. *πεζικός*; P. M. Meyer, *Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer in Ägypten* (Leipzig, 1900), pp. 65, 67, 93, 94. In any event, there is reason to believe that it is only because of the haphazard survival of evidence that *μάγιστρος πεδικῆς δυνάμεως* should appear now, for the first time, as one of the various forms of titulature of the *magister militum*. It will

suffice to cite two passages from the works of Libanius where the phraseology is probably not to be attributed to mere coincidence. In the first passage (Libanius, *Or.*, XX, 5, ed. Förster), when writing of a certain Barbatio, he employs the following circumscription for the office of the *magister militum*: μετὰ τοῦ ταῖς δυνάμεσιν ἐφεστηκότος. In the second passage (Libanius, *Epist.*, 1032) where, again, he is writing about Barbatio, he uses these words: ἄγων αὐτὸς τὰς δυνάμεις.

30-31. Αὐρήλιος Πέτρος Νεμεσιανοῦ: this man appears as scribe also in *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 181 (30), where his father's name is written Νεμεσιανοῦ. For the frequent change from α to ε in the papyri, see Mayser, *Grammatik*, I, i, pp. 55-9.

TRANSLATION

Aurelia Titouais, daughter of Hatres, of the village of Karanis, of the Arsinoite nome, to Aurelia Koutinon, of the city of the Arsinoites, greetings. I agree that I have received and have had measured from you nine artabs of wheat, interest in the amount of one half charged in advance, and three thousand talents in Augustan silver coinage (3000 talents) which are for the price of six artabs of barley (6 artabs), which I shall repay to you, in full, in the month of Epeiph of the second happy indiction with no delay and without any dispute, the right of execution, when you exercise it, being yours from me or even from all my property of all kinds and sorts as though by legal decision, and when the formal question was put to me I gave my assent. In the consulship of Domitius Modestus, the illustrious Praetorian Prefect, and Flavius Arinthaëus, the illustrious Comes and Master of the Infantry Force, Mecheir 9. I, the aforementioned Aurelia Titouais, received the nine artabs of wheat (9 artabs) and the six artabs of barley (6 artabs) and will repay them at the appointed time, as stipulated. I, Aurelius Petrus, son of Nemesianus, have written on her behalf, she being illiterate.

Verso: Deed: Titouais, of the village of Karanis: 9 artabs of wheat, and barley.

P. Col., Inv. No. 181 (28) November 4, 372 A. D.

26.9 cm. × 13.2 cm.

ὑπατείας Δομετίου Μοδέστου τοῦ λαμπρο-
τάτου ἐπάρχου τοῦ ἱεροῦ πραγμῶριου καὶ Φλ(αουίου)

- Ἄρινθέου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου κόμιτος καὶ μαγίσ-
 τρου τῆς παιδικῆς δυνάμεως Ἀθὺρ κζ.
 5 Ὁμολογεῖ Αὐρηλία Τετούεις Ἀτρή μητρὸς
 Ταπάειτος ἀπὸ κόμης Καραν[ί]δος
 Φλ(αουίω) Οὐεναφρίω στρατιώτῃ λεγεῶνος
 Πρίμα Μαξιμανῆς διακιμένης ἐν Ὁξυ-
 ρύγχων ἔχιν παρ' αὐτοῦ τ[ὴν] ὁμολογοῦσαν
 10 Τετούειν τὴν συμφωνηθεῖσαν τιμὴν σίτου
 καθαροῦ ἀρταβῶν ἕξ καὶ κριθῆς καθαῶς
 ἀρταβῶν ἕξ καὶ λαχανοσπέρμου καθ(αροῦ)
 ἀρταβῶν τριῶν ὅσπερ ἐπάνα[γ]κον ἀποδώ-
 σι τῷ Οὐεναφρίω μηνὶ Παῦνι τῆς β' ἡδι-
 15 κτίονος ἐπὶ τῇ[ς] πόλεως μέτρῳ τετραχοινίκῳ
 τὸ δὲ λάχ[α]νον δωδεκαμα[τ]ίω, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀπαι-
 τήσεως γίνεσθαι τῷ Οὐεναφρίῳ τὴν πρᾶξιν
 ἔκ ται τῆς ὁμολογούσης Τετούεις καὶ ἐκ τῶν
 ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῇ πάντων καθάπερ ἐκ δι-
 20 κης καὶ ἐπερ(ωτηθεῖσα) ὠμολ(όγησε).

Verso:

Χ(ειρόγραφον) Τετούεις Ἀτρή ἀπὸ Καρανίδος [σίτου (ἀρτάβαι) ς
 καὶ κριθῆς (ἀρτάβαι) ς] καὶ λαχάνου (ἀρτάβαι) γ.

1. 1. Δομιτίου. 3. 1. Ἀρινθαίου. 1. κόμητος. 4. 1. παιδικῆς. 8. 1. διακει-
 μένης. 9. 1. ἔχιν. 13-14. 1. ἀποδώσει. 18. 1. τε.

NOTES

3-4. For the title, see the note to *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59, lines 25-6.
 10. Τετούειν: There is no doubt whatsoever as to the reading of the final *nu*. Hence the name is treated as declinable, whereas in line 18, below, the indeclinable form Τετούεις is used where the genitive is called for.⁵ The nominative of the name is, in all probability, regularly Τετούεις (or Τιτούεις), rather than Τετούειν (or Τιτούειν), for, while the editors of *P. Osl.*, II, 38, followed by Youtie (see footnote 2, above), have read Τετούειν for the nominative case of the name, Lewis' suggestion (*op. cit.*,

⁵ Mayser, *Grammatik*, I, i, p. 265, observed the frequent treatment of Egyptian names formed on the *iota* stem as indeclinable. This tendency was extended farther still, for the scribes had a frequent penchant for retaining in the nominative proper names that were formed on various different stems. See J. Humbert, *La Disparition du datif en Grec* (Paris, 1930), pp. 163-4.

p. 322; see footnote 2, above) that the final *nu* was really a *sigma* resembling *nu* seems quite probable, not only because five of the six extant papyri where the name is mentioned have nominative Τετούεις or Τιτούεις, but also because the name seems quite clearly to be related to the following series of names in Preisigke, *Namenbuch*: Τιθόεις, Τιθόϊς, Τιθωής, Τιτοής, and Τιτόϊς. For the interchange of *theta* and *tau*, see Mayser, *Grammatik*, I, i, pp. 183-5. The spelling Τιτούεις occurs in *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59; and Inv. No. 181 (30). Τετούεις is the spelling in *P. NYU*, Inv. No. xvi; *P. Merton*, 37; *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 181 (28).⁶

14. The second indiction here is 372/3 A. D.

15. ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως: "at the city," presumably Arsinoe, where the deed was probably drawn up.

16. δωδεκαματίω: For the proper reading and interpretation of this measure we are indebted to Professor H. C. Youtie, who, with his colleague, Professor A. E. R. Boak, generously permits us to quote the following comment on *P. Cair. Isidor.*, 71, line 12, which will appear in their forthcoming volume of Isidorus papyri: "δωδεκαματίω: the *mation* is 1/12 artaba (Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.* I, 751 f.; for references see Preisigke, *Fachwörter*, s. v.; *LSJ*, s. v.). The ματιαῖον μέτρον is attested in *Sammelbuch* I, 4683, 6; the τριμάτιον μέτρον in Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.* 1018, 1; the ἡμιμάτιον in Guéraud, *Ostraca grecs et latins* (*Bull. Inst. fr. arch.* or. 41 [1942] 176)."

18. The name is treated here as indeclinable. See footnote 5, above, and the note to *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 181 (28), line 10, above.

TRANSLATION

In the consulship of Domitius Modestus, the illustrious Praetorian Prefect, and Flavius Arinthaëus, the illustrious Comes and Master of the Infantry Force, Hathyr 27. Aurelia Tetoueis, daughter of Hatres, her mother being Tapaeis, of the village of Karanis, makes acknowledgment to Flavius Venafrius, soldier of the Legio I Maximiana which is stationed in Oxyrhynchus, that she, Tetoueis, the acknowledging party, has received the

⁶ For the frequent interchange between *epsilon* and *iota* in Greek in Egypt, see Mayser, *Grammatik*, I, i, pp. 80-2; Kapsomenakis, *Voruntersuchungen*, pp. 63, 69.

covenanted price of six artabs of clean wheat and six artabs of clean barley and three artabs of clean vegetable seed, which of necessity she will repay to Venafrius, by the four-choenix measure, in the month of Payni of the second indiction, at the city, and the vegetable (seed she will repay) by the *dodekamation* measure, and, upon demand, Venafrius is to have the right of execution both from Tetoueis, the acknowledging party, and from all her property as though by legal decision, and when the formal question was put to her, she gave her assent.

Verso: Tetoueis, daughter of Hatres, of Karanis: [wheat, 6 artabs, and barley, 6 artabs], and vegetable (seed), 3 artabs.

P. Col., Inv. No. 181 (30) December 17, 372 A. D.

26.7 cm. × 14.2 cm.

ὑπατίας Δωμετίου Μωδέστου τοῦ
λαμπροτάτου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρχου
τοῦ ἱεροῦ πρετορίου καὶ Φλ(αυίου) Ἀρι<ν>θέου τοῦ λαμπρ-
οτάτου κόμης καὶ μαγίστρου τῆς πεδικῆς

- 5 δυνάμειος Χύακ κα. Ἀρρηλία Τιτούς Ἀτρῆ
μη(τρὸς) Ταπάι(ος) ἀπὸ κόμης Καραν[ί]δος τοῦ Ἀρσι(νοῖτου)
νομ(οῦ)
- Ἀρρηλίῳ Οὐενάφρι Σαραπίωνος ἀπὸ τῆς
Ἀρσινωιδὸν πόλεως χαί(ρειν). ὡμολογῶ
εἶλφαι παρὰ σοῦ καὶ ἱριθμῖσθαι ἀργυρίου Σεβ-
10 αστοῦ νομίσματος ταλάντων τρισχιλίων
ἐξακωσίων ὄντων ἰς τιμὴν κριθῆς
ἀρταβῶν ἕξ (κριθῆς ἀρτάβαι) s ἅσπερ σοὶ ἀποδώσω μη-
νὶ Παῦνι τῆς εὐτυχῶς β' ἰνδικτίωνος
ἀννπερθέτος καὶ ἀνευ πάσης ἀντιλο-
15 γίας τῆς πράξεως σοὶ γιγνωμένης
ἐκ ται ἐμοῦ ἢ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων
μου πάντων παντῶν εἰδὼν πρ<ά>τ-
τοντι σοὶ καὶ ἐπερωτητὶς ὡμολόγησα.
Ἀρρηλία Τιτούς ἢ προκιμένη ἔσχον.
20 τὰ τοῦ ἀργυρίου ταλάντων τρισχιλίων ἐξα-
κωσίων ὄντων εἰς τιμὴν κριθῶν ἀρ-
ταβῶν ἕξ (κριθῆς ἀρτάβαι) s καὶ ἀποδώσω τῇ προθ-
εσμία ὡς πρόκειται. Ἀρρήλιος Πέτρος
Νεμισσιανοῦ ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς
25 γράμματα μὴ εἰδύης.

Verso:

Χ(ειρόγραφον) Τιτούεις Ἀτρῇ ἀπὸ κόμης Καρανίδος κριθ(ῆς)
(κριθῆς ἀρτάβαι) ς.

1. 1. ὑπατείας Δομιτίου Μοδέστου. 3. 1. πραιτωρίου. 1. Ἀρινθαίου. 4. 1. κόμητος. 5. 1. δυνάμεως. 1. Χοίακ. 6. 1. Ταπάειτος. 8. 1. Ἀρσινοϊτῶν. 1. ὁμολογῶ. 9. 1. εἰληφέναι. 1. ἡριθμῆσθαι. 10. 1. ταλάντων τρισχιλίων. 11. 1. ἑξακοσίων ὄντων εἰς. 12. 1. ἀρταβῶν. 13. 1. εὐτυχούς. 1. ἰνδικτίονος. 14. 1. ἀνυπερθέτως. 16. 1. τε. 1. τῶν ὑπαρχόντων. 17. 1. πάντων παντοίων εἰδῶν. 18. 1. ἐπερωτηθεῖσα. 1. ὁμολόγησα. 19. 1. προκειμένη. 20. 1. ταλάντων. 20-1. 1. ἑξακοσίων. 21. 1. ὄντων. 1. κριθῶν. 22. 1. ἀποδώσω. 23. 1. πρόκειται. 24. 1. Νεμεσιανοῦ. 25. 1. εἰδυίας.

NOTES

1-2. τοῦ λαμπροτάτου τοῦ λαμπροτάτου ἐπάρχου: It is preferable, we believe, not to assume dittography here. Instead, we would see stilted formality, the first τοῦ λαμπροτάτου representing *vir clarissimus*, the second being the regular descriptive adjective with the title of the Praetorian Prefect.

4-5. For the title, see the note to *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59, lines 25-6.

9-10. ἀργυρίον Σεβαστοῦ νομίσματος: see the note to *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59, lines 9-10.

11. ἰς τιμὴν: see the note to *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59, line 11.

13. The second indiction here is 372/3 A. D.

21. εἰς τιμὴν: see the note to *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59, line 11.

23. For the scribe, see the note to *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59, lines 30-1.

TRANSLATION

In the consulship of Domitius Modestus, *vir clarissimus*, the illustrious Praetorian Prefect, and Flavius Arinthaëus, the illustrious *Comes* and Master of the Infantry Force, Choiak 21. Aurelia Titouis, daughter of Hatres, her mother being Tapais, of the village of Karanis of the Arsinoite nome, to Aurelius Venafer, son of Sarapion, of the city of the Arsinoites, greetings. I agree that I have received and have had measured from you for myself three thousand six hundred talents of Augustan silver coinage, which are for the price of six artabs of barley

(6 artabs of barley), which I will repay to you in the month of Payni of the second happy indiction with no delay and without any dispute, and you are to have the right of execution, when you exercise it, from me or even from all my property of all kinds and sorts, and when the formal question was put to me, I gave my assent. I, the aforementioned Aurelia Titoueis, received the three thousand six hundred talents, which were for the price of six artabs of barley (6 artabs of barley) and I shall make repayment (in barley), at the appointed time, as stipulated. I, Aurelius Petrus, son of Nemesianus, have written on her behalf, she being illiterate.

Verso: Deed: Titoueis, daughter of Hatres, of the village of Karanis: barley (6 artabs of barley).

To facilitate consideration of the six documents in which the name of Aurelia Titoueis appears, we have compiled a table (Table I, p. 167), which presents some of the more essential data with respect to each papyrus.

Of these papyri which document business transactions of Aurelia Titoueis, the three published hitherto are loan contracts, with interest included in advance (σὺν ἡμιολίας). The Columbia documents—with the partial exception of Inv. No. 59—are of a different form. Documents of the type of Inv. No. 181 (28), where Titoueis received an unspecified price for specified amounts of commodities, delivery to be made some months later, have sometimes been classified by jurists under the rubric *datio in solutum*, while documents of the type of Inv. No. 181 (30), where Titoueis received a specified sum for the price of six artabs of barley, delivery, again in this instance, to be made some months later, have been characterized as “sales on delivery.” There is now substantial agreement that both types should be classified as “sales on delivery.”⁷ The form of Inv.

⁷ For these contracts, see R. Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri*² (Warsaw, 1955), pp. 336-8, where the most important discussions of the subject are cited. A few of the important recent discussions may be cited here. F. Pringsheim, *The Greek Law of Sale* (Weimar, 1950), pp. 268-86, especially pp. 281-5; he thinks that the transaction is neither a pure loan, nor a pure sale, but consists, instead, of a mixture of elements. See also O. Montevecchi, “Ricerche di sociologia nei documenti dell'Egitto greco-romano, IV: Vendite a termine,” in *Aegyptus*, XXIV (1944), pp. 131-58; two articles by J. Hombert and C. Préaux: “Les Papyrus de la Fondation Égypto-

TABLE I

Date	Source	Commodities	Second Party	To Repay
Mechair 9 ¹ , (Feb. 3 ¹), 372	<i>P. Col.</i> , Inv. No. 59	9 art. wheat, <i>σὺν ἡμοῖς</i> ; 3000 tal. <i>εἰς τμήν</i> 6 art. barley	Aurelia Koutinou, of Arsinoe	Epeiph, 2nd indiction = June-July, 373
Hathyr 8 (Nov. 4), 372	<i>P. Col.</i> , Inv. No. 181 (28)	<i>τμή</i> (unspecified) 6 art. wheat, 6 art. barley, 3 art. vegetable seed	Flavius Venafrius, soldier stationed at Oxyrhynchus	Payni, 2nd indiction = May-June, 373
Choiak 21 (Dec. 17), 372	<i>P. Col.</i> , Inv. No. 181 (30)	3600 tal. <i>εἰς τμήν</i> 6 art. barley	Aurelius Venafer, son of Sarapion, of Arsinoe	Payni, 2nd indiction = May-June, 373
Thoth-Choiak (Aug.-Dec.), 373	<i>P. NYU</i> , Inv. No. xvi, 1	9 art. wheat, <i>σὺν ἡμοῖς</i>	Aurelia Koutina, daughter of Elias, of Arsinoe	Payni, 3rd indiction = May-June, 374
Thoth 6 (Sept. 3), 373	<i>P. Merton</i> , 37	27 art. wheat, <i>σὺν ἡμοῖς</i>	Aurelia Kottine, daughter of Ammon, of the quarter Phremei in Arsinoe	Payni, 3rd indiction = May-June, 374
Month 1, 374	<i>P. Osl.</i> , II, 38 (as revised by Youtie; see footnote 1, above)	40½ art. wheat, <i>σὺν ἡμοῖς</i>	Aurelia Kottine, daughter of Ammon, of the quarter Phremei in Arsinoe	Payni, 4th indiction = May-June, 375

No. 59 is mixed, being, on the one hand, a pure loan with interest included in advance, on the other, a "sale in advance." But whatever the juridical classification of the Columbia documents should be, such transactions as Inv. No. 181 (28), Inv. No. 181 (30), and Inv. No. 59 partly may well have been loans in disguise.⁸ Certainly the provisions of the advance sale contracts were admirably adapted as a hedge against inflation for the lender—loans in money to be repaid with commodities which rose in value along with the price level—and would, therefore, have been a most useful device in a century when many a less prudently negotiated debt was wiped out by the great inflation. At any rate, then—so far as these six documents are concerned—Titoueis was acquiring (borrowing) money, for the most part, in 372 A. D., but in the later months of 373 A. D. and in 374 A. D. she was borrowing grain. The 40½ artabs of wheat (σὺν ἡμολίας) in *P. Osl.*, II, 38 look like a borrowing undertaken for the purpose of repaying the 27 artabs contracted for in *P. Merton*, 37. Yet, however likely it may be that Titoueis was pyramiding debts and borrowings, it would be an unrewarding speculation to attempt to see in each of these six contracts a borrowing made for the purpose of meeting a previously incurred debt, for current crops could have furnished part of the commodities required for payment. Moreover, it is probable that during the years 372-374 A. D. Titoueis entered into more financial transactions of this nature than the six transactions thus far attested. And yet, this last observation need not necessarily indicate the existence of a Titoueis archive.

As regards the identity of the individuals with whom Titoueis had dealings, a few observations may be made. The Aurelia Kottine of *P. Merton*, 37 (written Κοττινη) is clearly the Aurelia Kottine of *P. Osl.*, II, 38. The name is uncommon,⁹ the father's

logique Reine Elisabeth, V," in *Chronique d'Égypte*, XIV (1939), pp. 161-70, especially pp. 165-70; "Les Papyrus de la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth, XI," in *Chronique d'Égypte*, XXI (1946), pp. 121-6. The most recent discussion of contracts of this sort in Coptic documents, along with citations of the apposite literature, may be found in A. Steinwenter, *Das Recht der koptischen Urkunden* (Munich, 1955), pp. 26-8.

⁸ This suggestion was made by Johnson and West, *Byzantine Egypt*, p. 171.

⁹ Preisigke, *Namenbuch* has the names Κόρος, Κόρτος, and Κότινος.

name is the same, and the quarter of residence in Arsinoe the same. But further attempts at identification run into difficulties, for definite recurrence of individuals may be established only when complete data (father's, mother's, and grandfather's name) or some very distinctive phenomena (such as unusual name or circumstance) are available.¹⁰ Moreover, slight variations in spelling of names are common, and they increase the difficulty of identification. Hence it is possible that the *name* Aurelia Koutina in the New York University papyrus may be the same name as Aurelia Kottine. Whether the names belong to the same *person* is another matter. Certainly the name is uncommon and the person to whom the name is attached in all instances resided in Arsinoe. But there is a very important, although not insuperable, difficulty in identifying these individuals as the same person. The father of Koutina was Elias, the father of Kottine was Ammon. We may have to do here, however, with alternative names, "Ἀμμων ὁ καὶ Ἠλίας, or Ἠλίας ὁ καὶ Ἀμμων, with only one of the names given in each instance, a practise known to be rather common, even in official records.¹¹ This contingency seems probable to us in regard to Kottine (Koutina), and we would, therefore, consider Aurelia Kottine and Aurelia Koutina likely to be the same person. Likewise, on the grounds of unusual name and of residence in Arsinoe on the part of both, we would consider Aurelia Koutinon, in *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 59, to be also probably the same person.

Aurelius Venafer in *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 181 (30), and Flavius Venafrius,¹² in *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 181 (28), are not otherwise

While the woman in our papyri with the name Koutina (Kottine; Koutinon) probably had a very considerable admixture of Egyptian blood, it is still to be observed that her name is Greek. Thus, the names *Kóτινος* and *Kοττινα* appear in W. Pape, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (3rd ed. by C. Benseler [Braunschweig, 1884]).

¹⁰ See the discussion of "Prosopography" by E. M. Husselman, in the Introduction to *P. Mich. Tebt.*, II, pp. 14-22, especially p. 14.

¹¹ The experience of the Michigan editors in the study of alternative names at Tebtunis was that "... From passages in which the identification of the person is certain we know (1) that either name might be used alone," See E. M. Husselman, in the Introduction to *P. Mich. Tebt.*, II, p. 15.

¹² A Flavius Venafer, veteran from Dionysias, is known from the Abinnaeus Correspondence (*P. Gen.*, 48 [346 A.D.]), but he is clearly of an older generation than the soldier in the Columbia papyrus.

known, but the latter is of interest because he was a soldier of the Legio I Maximiana, which was stationed at this time at Oxyrhynchus.¹³ The establishment of the military there in force is not otherwise attested before the Arab conquest, at which time, as Maspero informs us,¹⁴ the Foutuh al Bahnasâ has numerous references to the walls and garrison of the city. Earlier than this time—with the exception of the Legio I Maximiana in the papyrus we are concerned with for the moment—we have evidence only of more minor encampments at Oxyrhynchus. The names of two quarters of the city, retained still in Roman times—"Lycians," "Cavalrymen"—attest the presence of military encampments there in Hellenistic times,¹⁵ encampments not to be compared, it would seem, with the establishment of a Roman legion. In 103 A. D. a Latin letter, from C. Minicius Italus, the Prefect of Egypt, to the prefect of the Cohors III Ituraeorum,¹⁶ seems to show that that unit was stationed in Oxyrhynchus, but, as Lesquier has observed,¹⁷ its assignment there was probably connected with the exploitation of the quarries north of Oxyrhynchus.¹⁸ For the sixth and seventh centuries A. D. Maspero was able to cite evidence for very inconsequential military units at Oxyrhynchus.¹⁹ The problem is posed, therefore, why Oxyrhynchus, which had never been an important military center, should have become, in 372 A. D., the station, for the time being, of the Legio I Maximiana, which was regularly stationed at the time of the *Notitia* far up the Nile, at Philae.²⁰

¹³ *P. Col.*, Inv. No. 181 (28), 7-9.

¹⁴ J. Maspero, *Organisation militaire de L'Égypte Byzantine* (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, Fasc. 201 [Paris, 1912]), p. 140. He does not, however, give specific citations from the Foutuh al Bahnasâ.

¹⁵ We cite the following passages as examples. *P. Oxy.*, II, 247, 20-21 (90 A. D.): ἐπ' ἀμφόδον Ἰππέων παρεμβολῆς. *P. Oxy.*, II, 250, 19 (61 A. D.): ἐν τῇ τῶν Λυκίων παρεμβολῇ. See H. Rink, *Strassen und Viertelnamen von Oxyrhynchus* (Giessen, 1924), pp. 39-40.

¹⁶ *P. Oxy.*, VII, 1022 (= Wilcken, *Chr.*, No. 453).

¹⁷ J. Lesquier, *L'Armée Romaine de l'Égypte d'Auguste à Dioclétien* (*Mémoires de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire*, XLI [Cairo, 1918]), pp. 91, 96.

¹⁸ *P. Oxy.*, III, p. 214, introduction to No. 498; cf. K. Fitzler, *Steinbrüche und Bergwerke im ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten* (*Leipziger historische Abhandlungen*, Heft XXI [Leipzig, 1910]), pp. 71, 109.

¹⁹ Maspero, *op. cit.*, p. 140 (see footnote 14, above).

²⁰ *Notitia Dignitatum . . . in partibus Orientis* (ed. O. Seeck), XXXI,

We would suggest that the encampment of the Legio I Maxima in Oxyrhynchus in 372 A.D. is to be explained by the fact that, just at that time, the government found it necessary to resort to force in dealing with the perennial problem of flight from burdensome public services. While there is no literary testimony to this effect, Oxyrhynchus, there is reason to believe, was one of the centers of resistance, as we shall observe more closely at a later juncture. In the fourth century—and acutely in the sixth and seventh decades of the century—the flight took a form that differed somewhat from the *anachoresis* of earlier Roman times: a religious element now supervened. The beginnings of this kind of flight go back to the early years of the century, when, on October 21, 319 A.D., Constantine the Great, in his enthusiasm for Christianity, issued to Octavianus, the governor of Lucania and Bruttium, an edict which provided that *clerici* were not to be subject to any form of public service whatsoever.²¹ There is also evidence to show that the same privileges were extended to monks as well.²² But this preferential treatment of the *clerici* was quickly subjected to abuse, for on July 18 of the next year Constantine issued another edict—this time to the Praetorian Prefect Bassus—which provided that no person who had the requisite property qualifications for service as a decurion or in other public service should be permitted to take refuge in the clergy; and should he do this, he was to be removed from the clergy and restored to his proper service.²³

37. More recently scholars have placed the date of the compilation of the *Notitia Dignitatum* at various times between 375 and 425 A.D. Van Berchem thinks that the eastern section—while possessing strata of various different dates—reflects the army organization in the time of Diocletian. See D. Van Berchem, *L'armée de Dioclétien et la réforme Constantinienne* (Paris, 1952), pp. 7, 117. Citations of the recent work on the *Notitia Dignitatum* will be found there.

²¹ *Cod. Theod.*, XVI, ii, 2. See also J. Vogt, "Zur Frage des Christlichen Einflusses auf die Gesetzgebung Konstantins des Grossen," in *Festschrift für Leopold Wenger*, II (*Münchener Beiträge für Papyruskunde und antiken Rechtsgeschichte*, XXXV [Munich, 1945]), pp. 118-48, especially p. 122.

²² This exemption is attested by a letter of Basil the Great which requests a censor to extend the exemption to the monks in his diocese. See Basil, *Epist.*, Cl. II, No. 284, in J.-P. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, XXXII (Paris, 1857). But it is also implicit in *Cod. Theod.*, XII, i, 63. See Evelyn-White, p. 81, note 5.

²³ *Cod. Theod.*, XVI, ii, 3.

Nearly a half century later—although it was probably one among numerous times—the emperors once more attempted to check what may have been a similar evasion of service. This time, on May 10, 367 A.D., Valentinian and Valens addressed to Tatianus, the Prefect of Egypt, an edict which gave instructions that decurions were not to be permitted to remove to country districts.²⁴ It has been suggested that, to evade the provisions of this edict, the decurions became—or pretended to become—monks.²⁵ The plausibility of this suggestion seems to be supported by the fact that only a few years later, on January 1, 373 A.D.—or January 1, 370 A.D., for the date is not certain²⁶—Valentinian and Valens addressed to the Praetorian Prefect Modestus an edict which provided that all who had become monks to escape from compulsory public services were to be recalled to their proper duties, their family property to be confiscated (. . . *familiarium rerum carere inlecebris* . . .) if they did not comply with the terms of the edict.²⁷ At this juncture, in 373 A.D., following the death of Athanasius, a religious factor was added to the crisis. The Arians seized upon this opportunity to attack their monastic enemies now that they were under pressure from the political authorities because of their intimate association with the flight of the decurions from their public obligations.²⁸ An element of confusion is intruded into our picture of the situation, however, by the anti-Arian writers who constitute our sources, for there is some reason to believe

²⁴ *Cod. Theod.*, XII, xviii, 1.

²⁵ Evelyn-White, p. 81.

²⁶ The edict is dated by the consulship of Valentinian and Valens, but since no numeral appears with the consulship, scholars differ as to the date, some assuming Valentinian's and Valens' third tenure of the office (370 A.D.), others assuming their fourth (373 A.D.). O. Seeck, *Regesten der Kaiser und Päpste* (Stuttgart, 1919), p. 245, assigned the edict to 373 A.D. Among recent writers, Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien*, p. 380, adheres to the date 373 A.D., while 370 A.D. is supported by R. Rémondon, "Problèmes militaires en Égypte et dans l'Empire à la fin du IV^e siècle," in *Revue Historique*, CCXIII (1955), pp. 21-38, especially p. 34. Evelyn-White, p. 81, and Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, pp. 80-1, do not indicate a choice between the two dates.

²⁷ *Cod. Theod.*, XII, i, 63.

²⁸ Rather than give the detailed sources for this question here, we refer, instead, to Evelyn-White, pp. 77-80; Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, pp. 80-1.

that, through bias and the conflation of the two ideas of public service and military service that are implicit in the term *militia*, these writers portray for us violent attacks upon the monasteries and attempts to drag the monks into military service.²⁹ Whatever the facts may be, it will suffice, for the purposes of this article, to point out that the monks were certainly under pressure from the government, understandably so, since they were harboring delinquents from public service who were being sought out by the political authorities. And, naturally, the religious opponents of the monks made the most of their adversaries' discomfiture by joining hands with the political forces.³⁰ While the monks of the famous monasteries at Nitria seem to have suffered most from the forceful actions of their enemies and the government,³¹ it would seem to be very probable that the same political, economic, and religious factors were operative at other important monastic centers. And Oxyrhynchus must be regarded as an important monastic center, even if we do not take at full face value the report of the *Historia Monachorum* that, about twenty years after the assault upon Nitria, the Bishop of Oxyrhynchus was the spiritual superior of 10,000 monks and 20,000 nuns.³² In such a stronghold of monasticism the government might well have stationed a legion in this time of crisis. In this way, we suggest, the presence of the Legio I Maximiana in Oxyrhynchus in November, 372 A. D. is to be explained.

Two of the Columbia papyri published in this paper, both dated in 372 A. D., add their contribution to our meagre knowledge of the price of barley during the fourth century, but it is

²⁹ The expression *ad militiam cogerentur* is employed by Orosius, *Historia adversus Paganos*, VII, 33, while the phrase *ut monachi militarent* appears in Paulus' continuation of Eutropius, XI, 8 (*Eutropius Breviarium ab urbe condita cum versionibus graecis et Pauli Landolfique additamentis*, ed. H. Droysen, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica . . . Auctorum Antiquissimorum*, II [Berlin, 1879]). Cf. Evelyn-White, p. 82; Hardy, *Christian Egypt*, pp. 80-1. On the other hand, Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien*, pp. 162, 380-1, and J. G. Milne, *A History of Egypt Under Roman Rule*³ (London, 1924), p. 92, maintain that the monks were forced to serve in the army.

³⁰ See Evelyn-White, p. 83.

³¹ See Evelyn-White, pp. 81-2.

³² This is the report of the Latin version of the *Historia Monachorum in Aegypto*, §5 (edited by E. Preuschen, *Palladius und Rufinus* [Giessen, 1897]). The Greek version (§5) reports only 5000 monks.

possible that, owing to extraordinary circumstances—the rapidly worsening inflation, and, if our assumption in the preceding paragraph is correct, the political and religious crisis in Egypt—these prices may have been abnormally high even for that time. Certainly, a very abnormal situation is indicated by the steep rise in the price of barley—a rise of 100 talents per artab—between February and December of that year. See Table II. Here, at any rate, are the usable figures for the price of barley from the middle to the end of the fourth century A. D.³³

TABLE II

PRICES OF BARLEY, 350-400 A. D.

Date	Source	Price
ca. 346	<i>P. Lond.</i> , II (p. 305), 248	30 tal. per art.
Feb., 372	<i>P. Col.</i> , Inv. No. 59	3000 tal. for 6 art.
Dec., 372	<i>P. Col.</i> , Inv. No. 181 (30)	3600 tal. for 6 art.
388	<i>P. Lips.</i> , 63	1 solidus for 30 <i>modii</i> ³⁴

While the data are much too scanty to provide a firm basis for a price curve for barley during this period, still we should hardly have expected such high prices in 372 A. D. Nevertheless, even these prices fit into Mickwitz's general scheme for the development of the inflation: (1) between 346 A. D. and 360 A. D. the solidus fell to one twentieth of its value in the earlier year; (2) between 360 A. D. and 400 A. D. the inflation developed at a slower pace, the solidus falling to one third or one fourth of its value in 360 A. D.³⁵

A final observation may be made. Mickwitz, when he observed the growth in the number of "Pränumeration" loans ("sales in advance")—especially in the sixth and seventh centuries—

³³ See the prices of barley given, with citations of the sources, by Johnson and West, *Byzantine Egypt*, pp. 176-7. The price of 500 denarii for 13 artabs of barley in *P. Oxy.*, I, 85 (338 A. D.) can not be properly evaluated, for the content of the artab is qualified by the uninterpreted abbreviation ἀραλ().

³⁴ The solidus was worth ca. 8000 talents (= 1200 myriads of denarii) in 360 A. D. and by the end of the century was the equivalent of 4550 myriads of denarii, according to G. Mickwitz, *Geld und Wirtschaft im römischen Reich des vierten Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* (*Finska Vetenskaps-Societeten. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, IV, ii [Helsingfors, 1932]), p. 112; cf. p. 114.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 112.

reached the conclusion that they reflected a growth in "Naturalwirtschaft" and narrowed opportunities for purchase and sale (or, as he expresses it, there was less "wirtschaftliche Beweglichkeit"), which had the result that one borrowed from one who bought from him.³⁶ The situation was brought about, he thought, by the growth of "Grossgüter," as in Western Europe in the Middle Ages. Clearly that situation had not developed in the fourth century—nor did Mickwitz contend that it had—for Aurelia Titoeis entered into business relations with at least two individuals in Arsinoe and a soldier from Oxyrhynchus. Her repayments of loans with grain, rather than money, were made not because of "Naturalwirtschaft," but, instead, probably upon demand of the creditor, who thereby attempted to insure himself against loss in a time of acute inflation.

BARNARD COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

JOHN DAY.

SARAH B. PORGES.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 131-2.

THE PLACE OF CODEX VAT. GR. 1823 IN THE CEBES MANUSCRIPT TRADITION.

When Praechter published his critical edition of Cebes' *Tabula*, only twelve Greek MSS of this work were known to be in existence.¹ Scholars were still speculating about the possibility of recovering the lost codex Meibomianus, but Praechter's own efforts to locate this document had proved fruitless.² Recently it has come to the attention of the present writer that codex Vat. Gr. 1823 contains (ff. 152^r-161^v) a thirteenth MS of the *Tabula*.³ While this MS (here designated S) is definitely not the lost Meibomianus, it does assume more than average importance by virtue of the fact that it is clearly an ancestor of (and perhaps the immediate source of) Vat. Pal. Gr. 134 (P)—one of the twelve MSS already utilized—and, therefore, supersedes P in critical value.

The text of S, which is copied in a late fifteenth or early sixteenth century hand, breaks off abruptly after οὐκοῦν (38, 1, 5).⁴ Since this break occurs in the middle of a sentence at the end of the last line on the verso of f. 161, it is obvious that something has been lost by mutilation. In view of the close affinity existing between S and P, which will be demonstrated below, it is highly probable that S originally ended at 41, 4, 1, as does P along with a majority of the other MSS. Since in the format of S a single folium would be quite adequate to accommodate the intervening material, it may reasonably be inferred that only one leaf has

¹ Carolus Praechter, *Cebetis Tabula* (Leipzig, 1893), p. iv.

² Praechter, *op. cit.*, p. v.

³ The author wishes to express his gratitude to the Directors of *The Knights of Columbus Vatican Film Library at Saint Louis University* for permission to make use of microfilm copies of the Vatican manuscripts used in the preparation of this paper. At the same time he would like to express his thanks to the Custodians of the following libraries for their courtesy in providing microfilms of their Cebes MSS: Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, Biblioteca Nazionale di S. Marco in Venice, Biblioteca Laurentiana and Biblioteca Riccardiana in Florence, Biblioteca Corsiniana in Rome, and the Austrian National Library in Vienna.

⁴ The third numeral in the citations from Cebes is the line number calculated according to the line divisions in Praechter's text. This will doubtless vary slightly for other editions.

been lost. Several corrections of obvious errors in orthography have been made in S by a second hand. Also *καλῶς* (37, 3, 2), which was originally omitted, has been added in a late hand by someone who presumably had access to codex K⁵ or an early printed edition based on this MS, since this word is omitted by all the other sources. The same hand likewise inserted *θηρίον* (the reading of K and several other MSS) in the margin opposite 10, 1, 2 as a variant for *θύριον* and *σὺ* (the reading of K and C) above *εἰ* (38, 2, 2).

On the first page of S, between the title and the first line of the text, the following entry has been inserted in a sixteenth century Latin hand: *Hec et alterum manu Aristobuli una cum Hephestion*. The only scribe named Aristobulus listed by Vogel and Gardthausen is Aristobulus Apostolides (1465-1535), who is known to have copied over fifty MSS.⁶ The author has compared the writing of S with that found in four MSS which contain subscriptions identifying Aristobulus Apostolides as their scribe.⁷ All of the significant peculiarities of this scribe's writing as exemplified by these four MSS are absent from S. It must be concluded that the anonymous author of the Latin entry quoted above either was misinformed or was referring to some other scribe named Aristobulus.

The readings of S and P are in very close agreement throughout. S, in addition to showing all the omissions common to P and one or more other MSS, also shares the following omissions with P alone: 3, 3, 3 *μέν*; 11, 1, 1-2 *εἶτα . . . συναντήσῃ* (also omitted by W, but added in margin by first hand); 24, 1, 2 *ἡ ποῖ*. Of particular interest in this connection is the fact that both S and P repeat the passage *οὐδὲν* (33, 4, 5) . . . *γενέσθαι* (33, 5, 2). The first instance has been deleted in S, but this deletion is obviously by a much later hand. In addition there are a little more than fifty instances in which S and P agree against all other MSS in presenting erroneous readings. While many of these common errors, to be sure, consist merely in orthographical

⁶ For a complete listing of the previously known MSS and the symbols used in designating them see Carolus Conradus Mueller, *De Arte Critica Cebetis Tabulae Adhibenda* (Vireburg, 1877), p. 10 or Praechter, *op. cit.*, p. xii.

⁷ Marie Vogel und Victor Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Schreiber der Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 42-4.

⁸ The four MSS are Vat. Gr. 1311, 1396, Pal. Gr. 139, 149.

variations, the effect of all this evidence taken together is to establish beyond doubt the existence of a very close relationship between S and P.

There remains, however, the problem of determining whether the one is the source of the other, or the two derive from a common source. That the former is the case, with S being the source, is indicated by several instances in which S obviously represents an intermediate stage between the readings of the majority of MSS on the one hand and corruptions of those same readings in P on the other hand. The words δὲ (33, 4, 1) and μὲν οὐδεμία (33, 4, 3), which are omitted by P, are present in S; it would appear, however, that water or some other liquid was accidentally splashed on the page of S containing the two expressions with the result that serious blurring occurred in both instances. Although the words are still legible, it is apparent that the scribe of P (or possibly of some copy intervening between S and P),⁸ on seeing the blurred words, assumed that deletion was intended and thus deliberately omitted them from his copy. In writing δεινὰ οἶονται (31, 4, 3), the scribe of S apparently read the initial *o* of the second word as *β*, and thus copied δεινὰ βίονται. P's scribe, interpreting the first part of βίονται as the noun βίον, changed δεινὰ to make it modify βίον, thus producing δεινὸν βίον τε. S copied βλέποντας (31, 6, 2) as πλέποντας. P, being unable to make any sense out of this, left a blank space for three letters and copied ποντας. A similar development occurs in the case of ἐρμηνέως (33, 6, 1). The scribe of S apparently intended to write ἐρμυνέως (confusing *v* and *η*, as in many other cases). By a slip of the pen, however, *v* appears as a nondescript character halfway between *a* and *v*. This proved quite puzzling to the scribe of P, with the result that he wrote ἐρμ followed by a blank space for several letters. Where most MSS have πρότερον αὐτὸν (26, 3, 2), S, by a simple orthographical error, wrote πρότερον αὐτῶν. P tried to correct the passage by

⁸ Since there is no way of determining whether one or more copies intervened between S and P, it is to be understood that the phrase "scribe of P" employed in listing the following examples is simply a convenient device for designating the copyist who, in the transmission of the text from S to P, first made the particular change involved in each instance. It is conceivable, of course, that the actual scribe of P merely copied faithfully changes which had already been made by some predecessor.

writing *προτέρων αὐτῶν*. The pronoun *ταῦτα* (32, 5, 1), which appears in the text with an added accent on the last syllable because of the following *ἐστιν*, was written by S without any accent at all. P, in attempting to correct this, placed the acute on the last syllable, but overlooked the circumflex on the first. The adjective *δυσμαθέστεροι* (35, 2, 6) was erroneously copied by S as *διαμαθέστεροι*. P simplified this by writing *ἀμαθέστεροι*. Additional examples of the same type are: 20, 3, 3 *ταύτης*] *ταύταις* S, *ταύται* P; 33, 6, 3 *αὐτοῦς*] *αὐτὸν* S, *αὐτὴν* P; 38, 2, 3 *βούλοι*] *βούληιο* S, *βούληο* P.

These examples, showing, as they do, an intermediate stage of development between the archetype and P, point rather definitely to the conclusion that S was an ancestor of P. In complete conformity with this conclusion is the fact that, whereas there is no single case in which P fails to share omissions found in S, there is the following substantial number of instances (in addition to the two already cited) in which S does not share omissions found in P: 1, 2, 6 *πολὺς*; 3, 2, 3 *οὖν*; 9, 3, 3 *ἀν*; 18, 1, 3 *δ*; 20, 3, 3 *ἀδελφαί*; 21, 3, 6 *ἐστὶν ἡ*; 24, 3, 3 *τοῦ βίου*; 27, 2, 3-27, 3, 2 *εἰς . . . ἀπεγνωσμένοι*; 32, 3, 3 *ἐκείνας*; 33, 1, 2 *τι*; 33, 4, 4 *τὸ* (second); 37, 1, 1 *οὖν*. Further evidence tending to support the view that P is derived from S is provided by the fact that in the relatively small number of instances in which S and P disagree, aside from a minor number of cases in which P removes obvious errors in orthography, it is always S rather than P which is in agreement with the majority of the other MSS.⁹

Although all the lines of evidence agree in pointing to S as a source of P, there is obviously no way of determining definitely whether P was copied directly from S or was separated from S by one or more other MSS. But, whichever was the case, the

⁹ The following is a list of the most significant examples. Several instances showing mere variation in orthography have been omitted. 1, 3, 4 *προστάττων* S, *προστάττειν* P; 2, 2, 1 *οὐδὲ* S, *οὐ* P; 5, 1, 1 *οὖν ὁδὸν κελεύει* S, *ὁδὸν αὐτοὺς κελεύει* P; 6, 3, 4 *παρὰ τῆς Ἀπάτης* S, *παραπορεύονται* P; 8, 1, 6 *δοκοῦσι* S, *δοκοῦντες* P; 8, 2, 1 *οἱ* S, *εἷη* P; 10, 1, 6 *δοκοῦσι συνεῖναι* S, *δοκοῦσιν εἶναι* P; 10, 3, 3 *λεπτὴ* S, *ῥυπαρά* P; 10, 4, 3 *κακοδαιμονίαν* S, *κηδαιμονίαν* P; 11, 2, 3 *αὐτὸν* S, *αὐτὴν* P; *ἀληθινὴν* S, *ἀλήθειαν* P; 13, 2, 4 *περιπατητικοὶ* S, *περιπατηκοὶ* P; 18, 2, 1 *θυγατέρες* S, *θυγατέρα* P; 25, 3, 4 *πράσσουντι* S, *πράσσοντας* P; 26, 1, 3 *βούληται* S, *βούλονται* P; 30, 3, 3 *ἐστάναι* S, *ἐφεστάναι* P; 33, 1, 2 *δεῖ* S, *δὴ* P; 35, 1, 2 *τὸ αἷτιον* S, *τὸν αἷτιον* P; 37, 2, 1 *κακῶς* S, *κακὸν* P.

fact remains that, for critical purposes, P may in the future be disregarded in favor of S, except for the brief section extending from 38, 1, 5 to 41, 4, 1 which is missing from S by reason of the loss of the last folium.

It is assumed by both Mueller¹⁰ and Praechter¹¹ that the text of P derives from two separate sources, with the portion beginning with chapter 31 coming from some MS quite distinct from the one from which the first thirty chapters were copied. It is now apparent that P is derived in its entirety from S, but, since the text of SP in the portions before and after chapter 31 represents two different traditions, the problem of identifying those two traditions remains the same as before, merely shifting from P to S.

In his excellent study of the MSS of Cebes Mueller¹² divides the twelve Greek copies known to him into two families, with one being comprised of A alone, and the other made up of V and the ten remaining MSS, all of which, in his opinion, are descended either directly or indirectly from V. Of these ten L is considered by Mueller to be a direct copy of V; the rest, with the exception of P, are divided into two subfamilies, BRFEDW and CK, both deriving from V. In dealing with P Mueller simply points out in his general discussion that the first part of this MS (to chapter 31) belongs to the CK subfamily and the remaining portion, to the BRFEDW group.¹³ In his stemma, however, he becomes somewhat more definite, deriving the first part of P specifically from C and the final portion from BR.¹⁴

Praechter agrees with Mueller in placing all the Greek MSS other than A in a separate family, but, at the same time, he effectively refutes Mueller's contention that all these MSS have V as their archetype, setting up instead a division of the same MSS into four subfamilies: VL, BR, FEDW, and CK.¹⁵ He agrees with Mueller that L is a direct copy of V, and also accepts, without discussion, Mueller's account of the origins of P.¹⁶

The present writer, being engaged in the preparation of a new critical edition of Cebes' *Tabula*, has recently collated all thirteen of the Greek MSS from microfilm copies of the originals. His

¹⁰ Mueller, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

¹¹ Praechter, *op. cit.*, p. v.

¹² Mueller, *op. cit.*, p. 16.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 79.

¹⁵ Praechter, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xi.

study confirms the validity of Praechter's fourfold division of the late MSS.¹⁷ His examination of the evidence also supports the conclusion reached by both Mueller and Praechter that the first part of P derives from C (although it is, of course, now clear that S intervened between the two).¹⁸ He finds it difficult, however, to understand how Mueller and Praechter could have reached the conclusion that the final portion of P is derived from BR. As a matter of fact, a careful study of this part of the work in the fuller version of the SP tradition found in S (where none of the omissions which mar this part of P is present)

¹⁷ In fact, the evidence for his classification is somewhat better than he himself realized, since, as he indicates in his preface (p. iv), he had not seen the seven MSS in Italy, but had relied on collations of these made for him by his friend Tschiedel, and, therefore, was misinformed as to the actual readings of some of these MSS at certain points. In dealing with the FEDW subfamily, for instance, Praechter indicates (p. ix) that F and E are *gemelli*, descending independently from the lost subarchetype, while DW in turn derive indirectly from E. He admits (p. x), however, that this structure is inconsistent with what he supposes to be the readings of the four MSS at 2, 1, 2, where his *apparatus* lists FDW as changing the order to πολλὸν χρόνον πρὸς ἀλλήλους, while E agrees with all the other MSS in keeping πρὸς ἀλλήλους πολλὸν χρόνον and at 14, 2, 4, where FE are listed as reading ἐφήμεν and DW as having ἐφη μὲν. Actually, in both cases Praechter's worries are occasioned by erroneous reports on the readings of the MSS. In the first instance E agrees with the other three MSS of its subfamily in reading πολλὸν χρόνον πρὸς ἀλλήλους. In the second instance the reading ἐφήμεν appears only in F, while E agrees with the other two in reading ἐφη μὲν—a distribution which is entirely consistent with Praechter's stemma.

¹⁸ An examination of the *apparatus* of Praechter's edition would lead the reader to suspect that there are discrepancies between C and P where they do not exist. C is listed as agreeing with M against all other MSS in reading τοῦ for καὶ (1, 3, 3) and in reading παραγενόμενος for γενόμενος against all other MSS (19, 2, 3). Since P agrees with the other MSS in both of these instances, it might be doubted whether it or its source, if copied from C, could have restored the correct reading by conjecture. Actually, however, this in no way precludes the possibility of assuming that S (P's source) was copied directly from C, since an examination of C will reveal that the readings here ascribed to it are by a second hand, with the first hand in both cases having copied the readings which are found in SP and the rest of the MSS (except M in the one instance). According to Praechter's *apparatus* δὲ was inserted after βθεῖς (15, 3, 3) in C alone. Actually, however, the word is also found in both S and P.

shows much closer agreement with V than with any of the other three subfamilies. (L is not brought into consideration since its text ends at 21, 3, 2.) In several instances SP agree with V against all other MSS, including, of course, BR, both in readings which are correct and in others which are doubtful or clearly erroneous. In the sentence, οὐδὲν γὰρ κωλύει πάλιν ταῦτα ἀφελέσθαι καὶ ἐτέρῳ δοῦναι (31, 2, 1-2), VSP have the order πάλιν ταῦτα ἀφελέσθαι adopted by Praechter, whereas all the others have a different order: πάλιν ἀφελέσθαι ταῦτα (αὐτὰ F) BRFEDW, ταῦτα πάλιν ἀφελέσθαι CK. A similar situation is found in the sentence, οὐδὲν ἄρα, ἔφην, λέγεις ταῦτα χρήσιμα εἶναι πρὸς τὸ βελτίους γενέσθαι ἄνδρας; (33, 5, 1-2), where, as in the text adopted by Praechter, VSP have ἔφην after ἄρα, whereas RFEDW insert it after εἶναι, B after ἄνδρας, and CK omit it completely. The reading ποιήσωμεν (36, 1, 1) in VSP where all other MSS have ποιήσομεν is doubtless an instance in which V and SP are in agreement in an error. While the subjunctive provides a possible reading, the future indicative, which is adopted by Praechter, seems much better, and furthermore is confirmed by the reading *faciemus* in Elichmann's Latin translation of a ninth century Arabic paraphrase of the *Tabula*.¹⁹ In 36, 3, 2 VSP have ἐκείνο, which is clearly erroneous, in place of ἐκείνῳ in other MSS. The final ν of ὦν (35, 5, 7) has almost certainly been added in V by a second hand. S at this point has ὦ, which was corrected by P to ὦν.

In addition to the above examples in which SP agree with V alone against all other MSS, there are a few instances in which the two agree with CKV against BRFEDW: 31, 5, 1 ἔχειν CKVSP, ἔφη BRFEDW; and 33, 6, 4 οὕτω BRFEDW, οὕτως CKVSP. Note should also be taken of the fact that VSP (along with various other MSS) are in agreement in several instances in which the *apparatus* of Praechter's edition erroneously reports V and P as being at variance. Instances of such readings common to the three MSS are: 31, 3, 1 ἀλλὰ for ἀλλ'; 33, 2, 4 ταῦτα for ταῦτ'; 34, 4, 3 ἄνδρες for ἄνδρας; 36, 3, 4 τοῦτο for τοῦτῳ.

In spite of the close affinity between V and the final section of SP demonstrated above, this portion of S cannot be regarded as a copy of V for the reason that in several instances it agrees with other MSS against V. It is quite significant, however, that in practically all such cases SP rather than V have preserved

¹⁹ Mueller, *op. cit.*, pp. 76-9.

the correct reading, and in no such instance do SP agree with other MSS against V in a reading which can be labelled as unquestionably erroneous. At first sight the inclusion by SP of the meaningless $\delta\epsilon$ after $\tau\omicron$ in the expression $\tau\omicron$ τέκνα ἔχειν (36, 1, 4) appears to constitute an exception. Although Praechter lists only P as containing $\delta\epsilon$, the word also appears in R and F, or, in other words, in representatives of two of Praechter's four subfamilies in addition to SP. While it is true that V at present reads $\tau\omicron$ τέκνα ἔχειν, Praechter indicates that $\tau\omicron$ has been written over an erasure by a second hand. The microfilm copy of V available to the writer confirms this observation by Praechter and also indicates that the characters used by the second hand are in this instance about twice the size of the letters normally used by the first hand. Hence the space now occupied by $\tau\omicron$ is just about what would have been required for $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\epsilon$ in the script of the first hand. While no trace of $\delta\epsilon$ can actually be seen, since the original reading was quite thoroughly erased, there are certainly good grounds for suspecting that the word was at one time present in V. The wide distribution of this meaningless particle among the various subfamilies of late MSS suggests that it existed in the archetype of the family, passed into at least three of the four subarchetypes, and was removed from various individual copies, as apparently from V, by emendation. If this is the correct explanation of the situation, then the agreement of SP with other MSS against V in an incorrect reading has little significance in this particular instance, since the disagreement with V is probably only apparent rather than real, and since, in any case, the retention of the incorrect reading in SP could be interpreted as proving only that S was following the archetype very closely.

There are, on the other hand, several instances in which SP agree with some or all of the other MSS against V in preserving the correct reading. In 31, 2, 5, where VBR add $\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu$ πῶς ἴσους γίνεσθαι after γίνεσθαι, SP agree with all other MSS in omitting the passage. In 32, 3, 4 SP agree with all other MSS in reading ἀκρασία where V has εὐκρασία. SP join with a majority of the MSS in retaining οὖν (34, 1, 1) which is omitted by CKV. In 35, 2, 6 R and S alone have the correct εἰ ἀκνητότεροι, with εἰ ἀκνητώτεροι appearing in P, ἢ ἀκνητότεροι in CK, and εἰ εὐκνητότεροι in VBFEDW. In 35, 5, 3 CVK have οὕτως, but SP agree with all the others in having οὕτω.

While it is conceivable that a scribe copying from V might have been able to correct the text by conjecture in some of the instances just noted, such could hardly have been true in the case of οὖν (34, 1, 1). Since it is reasonably certain, therefore, that the final portion of S, though closely related to V, cannot have been copied from V, it is highly probable that this part of its text derives from some lost *gemellus* of V, and should be placed in the VL subfamily. Thus, while the first part of SP has no critical value by virtue of the fact that it derives from C which still exists, the final portion, on the contrary, assumes considerable importance as an independent witness of the V tradition, especially since V itself has long been regarded as the best source for the portion of the *Tabula* extending beyond 23, 2, 3, where the text of A breaks off.²⁰

The chief effect of S, interpreted from this point of view, is to confirm the validity of most of the readings adopted by Praechter. In the following few instances, however, agreement of S with a substantial number of other MSS in readings which have been rejected suggests that these readings may well be the correct ones. The text of Praechter for 31, 2, 3-7 is: καὶ διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν κελεύει πρὸς τὰς παρ' αὐτῆς δόσεις ἴσους γίνεσθαι καὶ μήτε χαίρειν ὅταν διδῶ μήτε ἀθυμεῖν ὅταν ἀφέληται καὶ μήτε ψέγειν αὐτὴν μήτε ἐπαινεῖν. The καὶ after γίνεσθαι has been included on the testimony of CK alone. VBR have the interpolation οἷον πῶς ἴσους γίνεσθαι (without καὶ); FEDWSP omit both the interpolation and καὶ. Since K is a copy of C, the inclusion of καὶ in the text is based on only one MS. If one punctuates with a dash after γίνεσθαι, the meaning is quite clear without the connective. The absence of καὶ from SP suggests that it was absent from the subarchetype of VL as well as from that of FEDW, and therefore should probably be dropped from the text. The spelling συντομωτέρως (33, 4, 4) depends on V alone. CK omit the entire clause in which the word occurs, but all the rest of the MSS, including SP, have συντομώτερον. This latter spelling should be adopted on the basis of the overwhelming MS support enjoyed by it. In 37, 3, 4 Praechter reads μοι δοκεῖς on the basis of CKV, although the rest of the MSS all reverse the word order. (Doubtless by an orthographical error S has δοκοῖς μοι, which has been

²⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 67-8; Praechter, *op. cit.*, pp. iv-vi.

corrected to *δοκεῖς μοι* by P.) While it is true that in other places in which the expression is used Cebes usually favors the *μοι δοκεῖς* order, the presence of the opposite arrangement in so many MSS suggests that this may well have been the order in the archetype of the late MSS at this point.

CHAUNCEY E. FINCH.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

TWO TERMINOLOGICAL NOVELTIES.

1. Ex-strategos.

In the papyrus collection of New York University there is a loan document of 329 A.D. (inventory no. XV, 14; unpublished) in which the lender, one Antonius Sarapammon, is styled ἀπὸ στρατηγῶν.¹ While this expression for "former strategos," or "ex-strategos," is unprecedented, the designation of a previously held office or status by ἀπὸ followed by the title in the genitive plural is common enough in the documents of the fourth century and later. The following examples will show the pattern: ἀπὸ στρατιωτῶν for "retired soldier,"² ἀπὸ ἐπαρχῶν for "ex-prefect,"³ ἀπὸ ἐπαρχῶν εἰλῆς for "former praefectus alae";⁴ similarly ἀπὸ βενεφικιαρίων, ἀπὸ ἐξακτόρων, ἀπὸ πριμιπλιάρων.⁵

These parallels lead us to expect ἀπὸ στρατηγῶν in the NYU papyrus, and one's first temptation is to find that reading by punctuating στρατηγ{ι}ῶν. But Antonius Sarapammon is similarly styled in a similar document in the Columbia collection. It would be preferable, then, if the new form could be explained without postulating a scribal error in both instances. Two possibilities will be suggested here.

One possibility is that the expression employs the genitive plural of στρατηγία, "office of strategos." If the genitive plural of the abstract noun seems strange, it is nevertheless not without precedent: for example, ἀπὸ στρατειῶν (= *a militiis*) is found as well as ἀπὸ στρατείας.⁶ Unfortunately, the picture is clouded by *P. Théad.* 15 (= *Select Papyri*, 262; 280/1 A.D.), where the advocate addressing the court is characterised as being ἀπὸ [συν]η-

¹ Antonius Sarapammon is known to have been strategos of the Arsinoite nome some fifteen years earlier: cf. *P. Strasb.* 45 (312 A.D.) and *P. Flor.* 54 (314 A.D.); revised text in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, IV [1908], p. 434; cf. now also *P. Cair. Isidor.* 54.

² Cf. J. Maspéro, *L'organisation militaire de l'Égypte byzantine* (*Bibliothèque des Hautes Études*, fasc. 201), p. 58.

³ Cf. *P. Lips.* 14, 3, and note.

⁴ Cf. *P. Lond.* 233, introd. (II, p. 272).

⁵ *B. G. U.* 1049, 2; *O. P. R.* 247, 3; *P. Flor.* 71, 697.

⁶ Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, *s. v.*, and D. Magie, *De Romanorum . . . vocabulis sollemnibus*, p. 127.

γοριῶν (line 2). The apparent discrepancy is perhaps explicable on the ground that *synegoria* is a professional status, which, once attained, is retained for life; while *strategia* is an administrative office, from which, once it is relinquished, one retains only an honorary title. In other words, an ἀπὸ συνηγοριῶν, one having attained the status of advocate, still enjoys that status, but an ἀπὸ στρατηγιῶν, one having held the office of strategos, no longer holds it.

A second possibility deserves consideration. The influence of Latin in the word-formation of postclassical Greek is particularly noticeable in the proliferation of adjectives ending in *-ιος*.⁷ Therefore, since Latin *praetor* is rendered in Greek by στρατηγός, it would not be surprising if imitation of *praetorius*, in which the suffix *-ius* conveys the sense of rank derived from previous officeholding, produced the adjective στρατήγιος denoting "former strategos." Indeed the neuter, στρατήγιον, was from Hellenistic times the Greek rendering of *praetorium*, the general's headquarters.⁸ Perhaps it is this adjective which is used in designating Aurelius Sarapammon as ἀπὸ στρατηγιῶν.

2. One Thirty-second.

Ancient Greek expressed small fractions (and their corresponding ordinal numbers) in two ways, e. g.

A. ἑξήκοστοτέταρτον, "a sixty-fourth"

or

B. τετρακαἰεξήκοστόν, "a four-and-sixtieth."

In the case of the fraction 1/32, the "A" form is τριακοστόδυνον. The "B" type has hitherto occurred only (I believe) in a few papyri of 299-303 A.D., *P. Cornell* 20 and 20a, and *P. Cair. Isidor.* 3 and 5. These texts appear, moreover, to evidence two discrete forms of the term. One, clearly attested in several occurrences, is δυοτρίαντον, a form obviously connected with the late (→ modern) Greek word for "thirty," τριάντα. The other is δυοτριακοστόν. This form, plausibly restored by the editors in *P. Cornell* 20a, line 53—but, unlike δυοτρίαντον, not admitted

⁷ Cf. e. g. L. R. Palmer, *A Grammar of Post-Ptolemaic Papyri*, p. 31.

⁸ Cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, s. v. *Praetorius* in the sense of ex-praetor appears in Greek as στρατηγικός (similarly, ὑπατικός = consularis): cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones, and Magie, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

into the Liddell-Scott-Jones *Lexicon*—is definitely attested in P. Wisconsin inventory no. 56 (unpublished). In that petition of 244/6 A. D. the writer complains that an official has registered his seven-aroura parcel of land as ἀρούρας δέκα ἡ[μι]συ δυο-τριακ[οσ]τ[όν, προ]σ[τοι]ήσας ἀρούρας τρεῖς ἡμ[ισ]υ δυοτριακοστών (lines 17-18).

Since the other words of the "B" type regularly connect the two component numbers with καί,⁹ it may be postulated that the original form of this new word was *δυοκαιτριακοστών. But with the example of the even further curtailed form δυοτρίαντον before us, there is no reason to doubt that, by the third century at least, δυοτριακοστών was in fact pronounced as written.

NAPHTALI LEWIS.

BROOKLYN COLLEGE.

⁹ Cf. 1/64, above; also 1/16 = ἐκκαιδέκατον, 1/22 = δυοκαιεικοστών, 1/24 = τετρακαιεικοστών, 1/72 = δυοκαιεβδομηκοστών.

REVIEWS.

ARTHUR E. GORDON in collaboration with JOYCE S. GORDON. *Album of Dated Latin Inscriptions. I: Rome and the Neighborhood, Augustus to Nerva.* Two volumes. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1958. Pp. vi + 160 + 6 + portfolio of 67 plates. \$15.00.

JOYCE S. and ARTHUR E. GORDON. *Contributions to the Palaeography of Latin Inscriptions.* Berkeley, University of California Press, 1957. (*University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*, III, No. 3; pp. xii + 65-242; plates 10-17.) \$4.50 (paper).

The Greek philosopher's idealistic dictum that all men by nature desire to know has as its corollary the American satirist's sardonic observation that "we always know So much that isn't so." We are forever weaving hypotheses into theories, and converting theories into premises, so that half the labor of scholarship must be devoted to the thankless task of demolishing old certainties or dissipating new speculations.

The epigraphers of Mommsen's generation, living in an age in which simple doctrines of linear evolution were prepollent in all domains of thought, could glance at a Latin inscription and confidently classify it with some such pronouncement as *litteris saeculi primi ineuntis*. But so many exceptions to the rules given in our handbooks have now accumulated that the time has come to re-examine the premises of Latin epigraphy—to lay the foundations of a more secure palaeography by clearing the ground of accumulated assumptions and theoretical constructions to find the bedrock of real certainties on which we may build anew. Professor Gordon, whose discovery of a new fragment of the *Laudatio Turiae*¹ was, in the circumstances, a most impressive demonstration of what can be done by the skilled eye and minutely retentive memory of an expert epigrapher, has, with the able assistance of Mrs. Gordon, addressed himself to this arduous task. The first installment of his work appears in the present volumes, which therefore require as systematic a review as the limited competence of this reviewer may be able to provide.

CONTENTS. The plates give with unusual clarity and detail one or more views of the whole or parts of 159 inscriptions, of which 129½ have been published in the *Corpus*, 23½ have been published elsewhere, and 6 are apparently here published for the first time. In the companion volume the texts are transcribed, the inscriptions are minutely described with reports of the maximum and minimum height of letters in each line and measurements of each abnormal letter, and virtually exhaustive commentary on all palaeographic details. The history of each stone is given, so far as it is known,

¹ *A. J. A.*, LIV (1950), pp. 223-6.

and the latest publication of each is collated. From these collations (of which fifty have been checked by the present writer) it appears that the present work corrects all but nine of the previously published texts in matters of some palaeographic significance. Given the purpose of this work, restorations and interpretations are considered only to the extent that they affect the reading of what is on the stone or the date of the inscription. The conclusions to be drawn from this palaeographic material are set forth in the *Contributions*.

The collection is limited to inscriptions *on stone* found in or near the city of Rome, and only a few are earlier than the time of Augustus. Of the 159 inscriptions, 100 either bear dates or can be dated within comparatively narrow limits by prosopographic or historical evidence, 40 can be assigned with certainty to a definite period such as a decade or part of the reign of an emperor, 16 can be dated on the basis of more or less probable identifications or inferences, and one is included to invite attention to the question whether or not it is a forgery. With only two inscriptions, therefore, is it necessary for the authors to depart from their announced plan and to assign dates on the basis of palaeographic criteria.²

FORMAT. Though carefully and expensively produced, each of these volumes bears an indication of the growing economic stringency that afflicts our hapless age. In the *Contributions* the footnotes, which, as is the function of footnotes, give not only documentation but also necessary qualifications or pertinent amplifications of what is said in the text, have been numbered by chapters and segregated at the end of the book, where the exasperated reader, who must keep all three volumes open before him on his desk, has to track them down while wishing that he had at least as many arms and as long a life-expectancy as Siva. The plates of the *Album* have a clarity and sharpness that is seldom found in pictures of inscriptions, but economy doubtless made necessary the reductions in size which will force you to use a magnifying glass with several of them, and in at least two instances (6a, 22b) will even then defeat your best efforts to read the smaller letters. The transcriptions of texts have been accommodated to a printing industry in which even the comparatively modest typographical devices of the *Année épigraphique* have become impossible luxuries—if, indeed, the necessary craftsmanship can still be procured at any price.

The transcriptions are in capitals (as all transcriptions should be—who, with a serious interest in epigraphy, can refer to Dessau without a shudder?), with the indispensable acute accents, tall I, and medial periods, but although they are set line-for-line, only one size of type is used, and there is no letter spacing, and no centering of lines. To such restrictions we shall all have to accustom ourselves, but in one instance, at least, we can make a better use of the resources left to us in our typographical poverty. To my eye, at least, the printing of a word as AGATH(TH *lig.*)OPVS is intolerable, and I venture to suggest the desirability of a convention whereby ligatures would be indicated by putting the first letter in capitals and the rest in the lower-case of which we now make no special use.

* Nos. 2 (tomb of C. Poplicius Bibulus) and 13 (tomb of Caecilia Metella).

AGATHOPVS conveys the information without delaying or puzzling the eye.

One may also complain that in the present work transcriptions are too often interrupted by unnecessary expansions—surely no one who will open these books needs to be told every time that C. before a nomen is the abbreviation of *Gaius*, or if he does, he should not be misled into thinking that the name was *Caius*. And there is a further objection to such expansions as VIXIT·AN(nis)·II, which the Gordons invariably use³—how do we know that the author of the epitaph was not sufficiently well educated to use the correct accusative? In general practice, I think, it is best to transcribe an inscription as exactly as is feasible, to place all exegetic material, including expansions, below the text, and, wherever there is doubt about the syntax, to give the author of the inscription the benefit of that doubt.

ERRORS. There are a number of *lapsūs typothetae*, of which the following seem the most important: No. 28b, line 7, read CASVS; 33a,4, read FLORVS; 64,6, read L(ucio); 86,3 and 118,5, the boxes are incorrect in terms of the system indicated on p. 14. On p. 122, col. 1, line 16 from bottom, something is wrong; perhaps we should read "except as a cognomen." Several other statements are not clear, and the English of the commentary is occasionally awkward, e.g. "Dipirus, a slave of another slave, Antigonus, who died," where the relative pronoun must refer to Dipirus.

No erasures should be indicated in No. 126; it is clear from the photograph that the stone was defaced either accidentally or by senseless vandalism. If the photograph of No. 112 does not mislead me, the commentary should note that the incorrect apex in IVLIVS differs radically in form from the correct one and from the four other clear apices on this stone; presumably, therefore, it is either an accidental chipping or an addition by a later hand. The statement that the apex on STATILIO in No. 39 is over a short vowel repeats an error common in our lexica, but we know definitely that the name is *Stätilius*.⁴ The name of the woman in No. 42 is not "Phoebe or Phoebena" but Phoebis (i.e. Φοιβίς, -βίδος), of which PHOEBENIS is the regular genitive singular according to the bizarre special declension of such names that we find very frequently in inscriptions, although not, so far as I know, in literature.⁵

There are a number of restorations and interpretations about

³ See especially Nos. 56, 68, 76, 77, 87, 99, 108, 120, 142, 153, 154; only in No. 101 is it certain that the abbreviations represent ablatives.

⁴ Ample evidence is cited by Wilhelm Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904), pp. 444, 166, 236; see also Johann Reichmuth, *Die lateinischen Gentilicia und ihre Beziehung zu den römischen Individualnamen* (Schwyz, 1956), pp. 111, 117. If it were needed, corroborative evidence could be adduced.

⁵ The anomalous declensions, of which I hope soon to present a study, are, in a way, the antithesis of a phenomenon that textual criticism has only recently taken adequately into account, the retention of Greek inflections, such as *Phaedrā* = Φαίδρα and *Hecatē* = Ἑκάτη, in verse, and perhaps even in prose, of the classical period. A dative in -ē, although normally indistinguishable from one in -ae in texts transmitted by Mediaeval MSS, may be indicated by the variant readings in such passages as Ovid, *Am.*, II, 6, 15 and *Ib.*, 359.

which debate is possible, but I shall here note only that the Gordons' long argument that the normal indication of filiation, F., must have been omitted in No. 79 is based on the assumption that the second line of that inscription was not centered, although they themselves reproduce four parallel inscriptions from the same site (Nos. 38, 41, 80, 84) in which the lines are centered and in all of which, as it happens, F appears at the end of the second line and would, of course, have been lost, had the stone suffered a fracture comparable to that which we see in No. 79. If the line in this epitaph was centered, we must read AGRIPPA[E·F to fill out the space, and we are spared the irksome conclusion that the imperial family could have been content to see Agrippina described as *M. Agrippae Divi Augusti neptis*.

STYLES OF LETTERS. The Gordons have made a painstaking and highly detailed study (*Contributions*, pp. 67-147) of the probable procedure in the layout and cutting of inscriptions on stone, the *ductus* of each letter (i. e. the order and direction of each cut), the different shapes of letters, and the wide variety of serifs. Theirs is the fullest treatment of the subject, and I do not see how exception can be taken to their cautious conclusions.

They propose certain changes in palaeographic terminology. I cannot see what is to be gained by coining the term "guided letters," which is susceptible of misunderstanding, to replace *scriptura quadrata*, a term perfectly descriptive of a style in which the horizontal strokes of such letters as T and E are at right angles to the vertical, nor do I see why *scriptura actuarial* does not serve as well as "freehand letters" to designate the style in which the tops of T and E are slanted upward and curved.⁶ These are aesthetically distinct designs, of which the first is intended to express dignity while the second shows graceful informality. It may be that we need to use the terms with greater rigor; I should not myself hesitate to say that the title line of the *Laudatio Turiae* (Plate 17) is in *scriptura quadrata* while the body of the text is in *actuarial*. If we use the two terms thus strictly, we (and the Gordons) will need a third term to describe the style of exaggerated asymmetry of which their collection contains two good examples (No. 128, A.D. 70, and 151, A.D. 91-92). The aesthetic purpose of a style is, of course, quite distinct from the skill or care with which it is executed, and if the term "freehand" is to be used at all, it should, in my opinion, designate the irregularity that is caused by failure to use mechanical guides (e.g. No. 30).

The results of the Gordon's minute study of letter-forms will be disappointingly negative to those who hope to determine dates by

⁶ Criticism of the established terminology (*Contributions*, pp. 66 f., 73 f.) because *acta* were usually inscribed on bronze and we are not quite certain what is meant by *quadrata littera* in Petronius (*Satyr.*, 29, 1) seems to me largely irrelevant. Palaeographers are not going to excogitate a new term to designate uncials, although William H. P. Hatch's article in *C. P.*, XXX (1935), pp. 247-54, has made it virtually certain that in antiquity *litterae unciales* were not letters of a specific style or shape; the term referred to the combination of large letters and very short lines that was fashionable for luxurious codices in the fourth and fifth centuries.

palaeography. They note that shading (i. e. contrast between thick and thin strokes) appeared about the middle of the first century B. C., the first example that can be exactly dated (No. 5) coming from 43 B. C., but variations in shading, at least during the period covered by their study, are indications of individual taste, not chronology, while letters of uniform thickness can be found in all periods, though not, perhaps, in good monumental work. Fully developed serifs become normal "some time before the middle of the first century B. C.," and serifs that drop below the line of writing are "not common in Rome from Augustus on." Certain shapes of some letters seem to have been more popular at one time than another, but there is no letter or combination of letters that can be taken as a sure indication of date—except, of course, the Claudian letters,⁷ which are found only during the reign of the imperial grammarian. In short, in the period from Caesar to Nerva, style of lettering is not an indication of date. The Gordons do not discuss in this connection what I have called "the style of exaggerated asymmetry" above, which may not be found before Vespasian and appears not to have become fashionable until later.

The authors properly emphasize the fact that accuracy of workmanship is not a criterion of date. Crude and shabby work is to be found in all periods, and so, within the limits of the study, is fine craftsmanship. I suspect that this will be found to be true to a very late period, since stone cutting is essentially a mechanical craft. On the Arch of Constantine, for example, where the sculptures attest not only a woeful corruption of taste but also the sheer incompetence of presumably the best sculptors to be found in Rome at that time, the central inscription is executed with quite satisfactory accuracy and regularity.

COLORING. The Gordons comment (*Contributions*, p. 73) on the coloring of incised letters in antiquity, and repeatedly have occasion to remark that the coloring applied to some stones in modern times misrepresents what a squeeze shows to have been incised on the stone. Since no one seems to have made the point, it would have been worth while to note that the use of paint probably explains some of the strange errors that we now find in inscriptions. In the first column of No. 119, for example, the cutter incised *IMPLRATORIS*, but it is probable that when he or another workman filled in the color, the missing strokes of the *E* were supplied in paint—and the customer may never have noticed the difference.

PUNCTUATION. The only punctuation which appears with any frequency in this collection is the word-divider. It would have been well to point out that this characteristic of Latin writing was derived, directly or indirectly, from Etruscan. In its origin it was probably a vertical line, such as is seen on the Phaistos-disk; in the earliest Etruscan inscriptions the line, doubtless to avoid confusion with *I*, is broken and formed by three dots; this is the standard form on the

⁷ No. 90 provides an occurrence of the Claudian vowel, which should be added to those collected in my article in *A. J. A.*, LIII (1949), pp. 249-57, in which I sought to show that the letter was taken from the Boeotian and Oscan alphabets and used by Claudius to represent *ȳ*, which therefore presumably had in his time a sound markedly different in quality from that of *ȳ*.

Fibula Praenestina and the Lapis Niger, but both show that a simpler form with two dots (:) had already made its appearance; the next stage of development may most conveniently be seen in the Tabulae Iguvinae, in which two dots divide words in the retrograde writing in the old alphabet, but the single medial point is used with the new alphabet. The single point became the normal word-divider in Etruscan (e.g. the Liber Zagrabienensis) and, of course, Latin, where it appears in our oldest Republican inscriptions. This makes it clear that the single medial point was the standard word-divider, and that the word-dividers in the form of crosses and outlined triangles, which the Gordons note as distinctively Republican forms, were merely decorative variations, corresponding in purpose to the later *hederae distinguentes*, of which they find no example before the reign of Tiberius.

The Gordons note carefully irregularities in the use of the interpunct and variations in the way of cutting it and hence its shape, but find no definite chronological indications other than that in the Augustan age the interpuncts become proportionally smaller in relation to the size of the letters than in many Republican inscriptions. I doubt that the statement (*Contributions*, p. 184) that "as a rule . . . no space [between words] is left for the interpunct" was intended to state a rule. The plates show conclusively that no such rule can be formulated for the period which they cover, although it is true that there are some examples in which interpuncts are merely fitted in to what would otherwise be *scriptura continua*.⁸ Although these examples anticipate what was to become prevalent in later times, no evolution can be discerned in the collection; in Nos. 147 (A. D. 86) and 156 (A. D. 83-96), for example, the interpunct has as much space and is as prominent as in No. 4 (44-43 B. C.).

Although the *Album* contains some interesting examples of the stronger marks of punctuation that show grammatical structure, these are not sufficiently common to serve as indications of date.

APICES. The Gordons' study of the use of the apex will be of great interest to anyone who wishes to carry on the work of Christiansen, whose fundamental dissertation⁹ is now in need of considerable revision and amplification. There are, however, some considerations that we should bear in mind in interpreting the data.

It is true that the use of the apex to mark long vowels frequently seems capricious to us, and that instances of it over diphthongs and short vowels, too frequent to be mere blunders by the engraver, seem inexplicable, but we must remember that in a city such as Rome, which, like New York City, was a *colluvies nationum*, there must have been many pronunciations of Latin, and that consequently mispronunciations of many words must from time to time have gained

⁸ On the use of the interpunct in early manuscripts, see *T. A. P. A.*, LXXXII (1951), pp. 241-3, where I permit myself to speculate concerning the reasons for its gradual disappearance.

⁹ *De apicibus et I longis inscriptionum Latinarum*, scripsit Jacobus Christiansen (apud C. F. Delff Husumensem, 1889). This book was published at Husum (of which the Latin name is *Husumum* or *Husenium*) in Schleswig-Holstein; the Gordons (*Album*, p. 49) were misled by what is at least an omission, if not a downright error, in Graesse's *Orbis Latinus*.

currency even in fashionable circles (which are never coëxtensive with cultivated circles). Some of the apices that we recognize as false probably reflect current mispronunciations, while many more, for which we can see no purpose, were doubtless intended to show that their writers knew better than to commit vulgar errors of which all trace has been lost to us. For a few peculiarities other explanations are *possible*. I have frequently toyed with the idea that the apex found with such remarkable frequency in CAÉSAR may have been intended to show a connection between that name and the Etruscan word for 'god,' which Suetonius (*Aug.* 97,2) and Dio Cassius (LVI, 29,4) report as *aesar* (presumably Etruscan *aiser*).

I-LONGA. The Gordons have made (*Contributions*, pp. 186-201) an extraordinarily thorough and valuable study of the use of this letter, and have constructed a series of tables to show its occurrence in its various functions from the time of Augustus to the fifth century. Since their results are a little obfuscated by failure to recognize the existence of the diphthong *ei* in Latin, it will be best to summarize here the functions of a vexingly polysemous symbol.¹⁰ It is certain that I-longa was used to represent

(1) *i* (VIXIT, IPSIVS, etc.). This, of course, is its most common and obvious use.

(2) part of the diphthong *ei* (DEINDE). It is probable, therefore, that the man who spells his name VEIDIANVS was not guilty of ignorant affectation, as the Gordons suppose, but wished his name to be pronounced with the diphthong which, as we must infer from the unvarying scansion of the word in verse, was always pronounced in *deinde*, at least until the fourth century.

(3) part of a diphthong + *j* (MAIA, EIVS, POMPEIVS, CVIVS). Such words were, of course, pronounced *mai-ja*, etc.

(4) *j* (CONIVNX, IANVARIVS). The statistics which show that I-longa is frequently a consonant in initial position, but rarely in medial position, merely reflect the fact that only a few words in Latin have an internal *j*, while there are many that begin with *j*.

(5) a kind of emphasis. This usage evidently begins with the word *imperator* used as a praenomen, and a pronunciation *im-* is excluded by the Gordons' report that in the Augustan stones of their collection "the I of *imp.* is never tall unless the word has first position in the line and begins a syntax unit." From the time of Hadrian a tall I is common in praenominal *imperator*, whatever the position in the line, but is only rarely found when the word follows the name of the emperor. From the time of Vespasian tall I also appears in *in* and *item* and occasionally as the initial letter of a few other words, presumably for emphasis or decoration. The Gordons' study has greatly clarified this non-phonetic use of the letter.

To the foregoing should be added two inconsistent uses of the

¹⁰ For further discussion of this letter, see *A. J. A.*, LIII (1949), pp. 255 f., where I failed to distinguish the use which I list as second here. In note 60 of that article my statement concerning *dies* in the fragment of Livius Andronicus is incorrect; I now see that the word could be scanned with an *i*.

letter which the Gordons do not particularly note: (1) the use of *I-longa* to represent \bar{i} (e. g. No. 112. *ivLI*, nominative plural), and (2) the use of the combination *IL* to represent \bar{i} when the long vowel is the result of contraction; this is made certain by metrical inscriptions, such as *C. I. L. VI*, 29896, in which *svbIL* is clearly a contracted perfect which must be scanned *sūbī*. This probably accounts for the many occurrences of *diIs*.

Among the remaining uses of *I-longa*, one of the most puzzling is its occasional use in words, chiefly proper names, ending in *-ius*. It is, of course, obviously correct in such names as *APHNIVS* (*Ἀφνειός*), but what are we to make of it in such names as *CLAVDIA*?¹¹ It is possible, of course, that the semi-educated may have thought it smart to give Latin names a distinctively Greek form; alternatively, Latin may have had, in addition to *i* and \bar{i} , a short close vowel, which may be what is indicated in *HODIE*, *SALVIO*, *PISSIMVS*, and similar forms, possibly including *OPTIMVS*. But the Gordons have found and published (No. 51) a carefully and elegantly cut inscription in which *HERODIAS* is divided between two lines thus, *HEROD|IAS*, which, given the fact that the rules of syllabic division are almost invariably observed in even the crudest work, makes it extremely probable that the name was pronounced *Herodjas*. This may have been no more than a personal eccentricity, but a few corroborative examples would force us to revise our theory of the Latin pronunciation prevalent in the first century.

NUMERALS. The Gordons have made a very thorough study (pp. 166-82) of the forms of numerals, the relative frequency of the subtractive (e. g. *IX*) and additive (*VIII*) modes of writing, and the use of bars over cardinals, ordinals, and the corresponding adjectives and adverbs. Theirs is by far the fullest treatment of the subject, and this chapter alone would make their book indispensable to epigraphers.

Our handbooks all assure us that the numeral for 500 is *D*, which is obviously half of Φ , and this statement seems entirely reasonable because it is obvious that in the numerals of the type seen on the Columna Rostrata, the sign for 50,000 is merely half of the sign for 100,000, and the latter is merely Φ multiplied by circumscribed circles. Under the influence of this dictum we have tended to regard all the occurrences of *D* as both exceptions and inconsistencies (since *V*, *X*, and *C* are never transfixed with a bar when they are used as numerals). But the Gordons now report that an examination of their entire collection of squeezes and photographs indicates that from the earliest times to at least the end of the second century A. D. *only D* was used to represent 500. This, obviously, is *not* half of Φ . Without attempting to solve the problem here, we may observe that *D* is a recognized letter of the Paelignian alphabet, in which it is thought to have represented the palatal sound heard in French *je*,¹²

¹¹ One occurrence of this name is in No. 156, an inscription which perfectly illustrates the ambiguity of the letter, since it also has *CONIVGI* and *vIX* (it).

¹² R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects* (Cambridge, 1897), Nos. 206, 216; W. M. Lindsay, *C. R.*, VII (1893), p. 103, describes the sound as the palato-dental found in Italian *maggio*.

and reappears in the Latin inscriptions of Gaul to represent the so-called *spirans Gallica* in proper names.¹³

CONCLUSIONS. The results of the Gordons' laborious and meticulous investigation could, in a sense, be epitomized by the two inscriptions shown on their Plate 20. Note the contrast:

- (a) tall, slender letters; slight shading; additive numeral; apex; 5 *I-longae*; tall K (for *kalendae*); no ligatures; EVDOXSVS.
- (2) letters more nearly square; strong shading; subtractive numeral; no apex; no *I-longa* (but one EI for -i); normal K; *eleven* ligatures, including at least three of the kind that we do not expect to find before the late second century; EVDOXVS.

I suspect that not a few of us would be inclined to separate these inscriptions by at least a century, if we had to guess their dates on the basis of palaeographic details. But these are the two sides of an altar dedicated on 18 September, 2 B.C., and the two sides must have been inscribed (by different workmen, of course) within a few days (or, at most, weeks) of each other.¹⁴ Let that be a lesson to us!

REVILO P. OLIVER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

ANGELO BRELICH. Gli eroi greci. Un problema storico-religioso. Roma, Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1958. Pp. xii + 410; 7 pls. (*Università di Roma, Pubblicazioni della Scuola di Studi Storico-religiosi*, 4.)

Gods, heroes, men. To classical Greece the distinction between these three classes seemed as self-evident as that between God and man seems to us. It is the heroes, the *ἥμιθεοι*, who give us pause. "Semi-divine" is not a concept current in our culture. Yet the classical belief about heroes is clear and unambiguous, however late the sources that attempt a systematic definition. The hero begins as a man, who lives and dies; unlike other men, however, he is powerful in death, and his supernatural powers are exerted from the tomb. His cult is normally, therefore, local and unique. Is he, then, simply a local divinity, some minor god whom an accident of history or geography has isolated? Attic cult inscriptions, in fact, do sometimes apply the term *θεός* to the heroes. But this is purely honorific.

¹³ See the indices to *C. I. L.*, XII and XIII; good examples in Dessau, especially Nos. 2911, 4655.

¹⁴ It is not probable that such work was ordered long in advance of the day on which it was presumably set up and dedicated. What I infer from the discrepancies in the text on the two sides is that after (a) was inscribed, Florus failed to pay his share, which was probably made up by contributions from the two Savonii, but there was still hope that he would pay up, since space for his name was left on (b). All this could have taken place in two or three days, or, conceivably, a single day, while the altar was in production in the manufactory from which it had been ordered.

cant connection of cult and myth. On the contrary this "Nourisher," whose cult is oracular, appears in myth as an architect, an arch-thief, and a murderer. Cult name, cult function, and myth are, so far as our sources go, totally incongruent. Farnell simply assumed that floating tales were attached to his name outside of Boeotia, and that the myth has no relevance to the cult. But in fact some of the persistent features of the myth seem securely localized, and since they have not been standardized or moralized through literary treatment they should be meaningful. If not specifically for the cult of Trophonius, are they, perhaps, meaningful for the hero as such?

Which are the recurrent themes of heroic myth and cults? Most prominent is that of the *Hero and Death*. A tomb is the normal locale of the cult; only rarely is the existence of a tomb denied. The sacrifice is commonly (though not exclusively) funereal in type, and there is often a complex ritual of mourning. In myth the heroes, with few exceptions, die, and many die violently or prematurely young. *Hero and Combat*. The heroes are above all warriors, and one of their most common functions is to protect their own city or people in war. Telamon and Ajax were invoked before the battle of Salamis; the Cretans sacrificed to Idomeneus and Meriones in war. Here myth and function do correspond. More significant, however, is the story in Herodotus (I, 67), that to defeat Tegea the Spartans must obtain the bones of Orestes. But Orestes had no fame as a warrior. The role ascribed to him rests simply on his status as a hero. Again, *Agonistic Contests* are closely associated with heroes. Besides the numerous games directly in their honor, heroes appear in one guise or another in many games dedicated to divinities (e.g. Pelops at Olympia, Opheltes at Nemea). Nearly all heroes were athletes, and many were founders of games or inventors of some special athletic skill. What is more, outstanding athletes, even in historical times, were heroized. Those who find it hard to reconcile the combination of religion and athletics would do well to ponder the words of Pausanias (V, 10, 1), who cites side by side the Eleusinian mysteries and the Olympic games as notable instances of divine concern. Closely allied to one another are the *Mantic* and *Healing* qualities of heroes, forming virtually a single art, *iatromantikê*. Such diverse heroes as Heracles, Odysseus, and Orpheus render oracles, while the oracular shrine of the seer Amphiaraus was in practice chiefly concerned with healing. Even athletic heroes, such as the famous Theagenes of Thasos, might become healers (Paus., VI, 11, 9).

Brellich's next two sections, on *Mysteries* and *Passage to Adulthood* show more tenuous and less convincing links with the heroes. And finally, his last three headings, *City-state*, *Blood-groups*, and *Human Activities* may well be considered together. Here we have the "founders," the inventors, and the "first men": virtually every human activity and institution has its heroic originator. Here Brellich makes two comments that are worth noting. The "inventions" ascribed to the heroes are, in general, those functional to human life; they do not include the later crafts, and no hero is worshipped exclusively by "trade" groups. The "inventions" relate either to the broad levels of human existence (e.g. agriculture, urban life) or to particular activities (e.g. war, oracles, slavery, agonistic) that are in themselves religiously significant or are basic to organized society.

No Greek really confused the two: the hero's close association with a tomb was a constant reminder of his original mortality.

The closest analogy in our own culture is the Christian saint. There are significant differences, but both saint and hero achieve recognition on the basis of proven power, a power that the ordinary dead do not have and that is therefore in some sense supernatural. Again, while the vast majority of both saints and heroes derive from a shadowy and more or less legendary past, the number of known individuals who have achieved sainthood or heroic status in the clear light of history is not inconsiderable. The detection of an occasional intruder like the unique St. Demetra of Eleusis (a "faded" god?) or St. Orestes of Soracte (an etymological blunder?) is hardly sufficient to discredit the Christian doctrine of sainthood. The human origin of the Greek hero seemed to antiquity equally certain and undeniable.

Not so to modern scholarship. One hero after another has been identified as a "faded" god, as a purely fictional ancestor, or as one of innumerable "functional" divinities. Farnell's classic study distinguishes seven classes of heroes, of which only one or two would conform to the Greek belief. The divine origin of a Helen or a Hyacinthus does, indeed, seem clearly indicated by the evidence, and many eponymous heroes may well be "transparent fictions." But theories are heady things, and it is tempting to follow them with too great enthusiasm. Farnell is wisely sceptical of some of Usener's extremes, but even he is ready to dismiss a Daides or Deipneus as "obviously late creations." The well-known case of Dexion should be a warning. Were it not for the specific information we have, who would ever have suspected that the "Receiver" was in fact, not a "functional hero," but the heroized poet Sophocles? Where our information is so scanty, often little more than a name, it is surely hazardous to disregard the unanimous opinion of those to whom the heroes were a vital part of religion.

Brelich's study provides a refreshingly new approach. He says, in effect, "If the heroes are so heterogeneous in nature and origin, how are we to explain the fact that in the view of the classical period they formed a *particular* category, quite distinct from the category of gods, daimones, or ordinary humans?" Granted the nature of our evidence, which with few exceptions is inadequate for the individual case, Brelich sets out to discover what things are characteristic of the heroes as a class, and in particular to correlate recurrent elements of heroic myth with what we know of heroic cult practices. In so far as persistent features emerge, we can hope to gain insight into what, for the Greeks themselves, was typical of the heroes.

Before embarking on his systematic analysis, Brelich first illustrates the problem by considering the complex figure of Trophonius. Though Trophonius is never called a hero—indeed, in some inscriptions he is styled Zeus Trophonius—, his myth is exclusively human (i.e. heroic). His name clearly means "Nourisher," and it has therefore been assumed that he was a local god or daimon of fertility; yet his cult, so far as our evidence indicates, is primarily oracular. Trophonius was not an epic hero, and since his myths were not therefore subject to extensive literary revision we might look for a signifi-

letter which the Gordons do not particularly note: (1) the use of *I-longa* to represent *-ī* (e. g. No. 112, *IVLI*, nominative plural), and (2) the use of the combination *II* to represent *-i* when the long vowel is the result of contraction; this is made certain by metrical inscriptions, such as *C. I. L. VI*, 29896, in which *SVBI* is clearly a contracted perfect which must be scanned *sūbī*. This probably accounts for the many occurrences of *DI*s.

Among the remaining uses of *I-longa*, one of the most puzzling is its occasional use in words, chiefly proper names, ending in *-ius*. It is, of course, obviously correct in such names as *APHNIVS* (*Ἀφνειός*), but what are we to make of it in such names as *CLAVDIA*?¹¹ It is possible, of course, that the semi-educated may have thought it smart to give Latin names a distinctively Greek form; alternatively, Latin may have had, in addition to *ī* and *i*, a short close vowel, which may be what is indicated in *HODIE*, *SALVIO*, *PLISSIMVS*, and similar forms, possibly including *OPTIMVS*. But the Gordons have found and published (No. 51) a carefully and elegantly cut inscription in which *HERODIAS* is divided between two lines thus, *HEROD|IAS*, which, given the fact that the rules of syllabic division are almost invariably observed in even the crudest work, makes it extremely probable that the name was pronounced *Herodjas*. This may have been no more than a personal eccentricity, but a few corroborative examples would force us to revise our theory of the Latin pronunciation prevalent in the first century.

NUMERALS. The Gordons have made a very thorough study (pp. 166-82) of the forms of numerals, the relative frequency of the subtractive (e. g. *IX*) and additive (*VIII*) modes of writing, and the use of bars over cardinals, ordinals, and the corresponding adjectives and adverbs. Theirs is by far the fullest treatment of the subject, and this chapter alone would make their book indispensable to epigraphers.

Our handbooks all assure us that the numeral for 500 is *D*, which is obviously half of *Ϟ*, and this statement seems entirely reasonable because it is obvious that in the numerals of the type seen on the Columna Rostrata, the sign for 50,000 is merely half of the sign for 100,000, and the latter is merely *Ϟ* multiplied by circumscribed circles. Under the influence of this dictum we have tended to regard all the occurrences of *D* as both exceptions and inconsistencies (since *V*, *X*, and *C* are never transfixes with a bar when they are used as numerals). But the Gordons now report that an examination of their entire collection of squeezes and photographs indicates that from the earliest times to at least the end of the second century A. D. *only D* was used to represent 500. This, obviously, is *not* half of *Ϟ*. Without attempting to solve the problem here, we may observe that *D* is a recognized letter of the Paelignian alphabet, in which it is thought to have represented the palatal sound heard in French *je*,¹²

¹¹ One occurrence of this name is in No. 156, an inscription which perfectly illustrates the ambiguity of the letter, since it also has *CONIVGI* and *VIX* (it).

¹² R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects* (Cambridge, 1897), Nos. 206, 216; W. M. Lindsay, *C. R.*, VII (1893), p. 103, describes the sound as the palato-dental found in Italian *maggio*.

and reappears in the Latin inscriptions of Gaul to represent the so-called *spirans Gallica* in proper names.¹³

CONCLUSIONS. The results of the Gordons' laborious and meticulous investigation could, in a sense, be epitomized by the two inscriptions shown on their Plate 20. Note the contrast:

- (a) tall, slender letters; slight shading; additive numeral; apex; 5 *I-longae*; tall K (for *kalendae*); no ligatures; EVDOXSVS.
- (2) letters more nearly square; strong shading; subtractive numeral; no apex; no *I-longa* (but one EI for *-i*); normal K; *eleven* ligatures, including at least three of the kind that we do not expect to find before the late second century; EVDOXVS.

I suspect that not a few of us would be inclined to separate these inscriptions by at least a century, if we had to guess their dates on the basis of palaeographic details. But these are the two sides of an altar dedicated on 18 September, 2 B.C., and the two sides must have been inscribed (by different workmen, of course) within a few days (or, at most, weeks) of each other.¹⁴ Let that be a lesson to us!

REVILO P. OLIVER.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

ANGELO BRELICH. Gli eroi greci. Un problema storico-religioso.

Roma, Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1958. Pp. xii + 410; 7 pls.

(*Università di Roma, Pubblicazioni della Scuola di Studi Storico-religiosi*, 4.)

Gods, heroes, men. To classical Greece the distinction between these three classes seemed as self-evident as that between God and man seems to us. It is the heroes, the *ἥμιθεοι*, who give us pause. "Semi-divine" is not a concept current in our culture. Yet the classical belief about heroes is clear and unambiguous, however late the sources that attempt a systematic definition. The hero begins as a man, who lives and dies; unlike other men, however, he is powerful in death, and his supernatural powers are exerted from the tomb. His cult is normally, therefore, local and unique. Is he, then, simply a local divinity, some minor god whom an accident of history or geography has isolated? Attic cult inscriptions, in fact, do sometimes apply the term *θεός* to the heroes. But this is purely honorific.

¹³ See the indices to *C. I. L.*, XII and XIII; good examples in Dessau, especially Nos. 2911, 4655.

¹⁴ It is not probable that such work was ordered long in advance of the day on which it was presumably set up and dedicated. What I infer from the discrepancies in the text on the two sides is that after (a) was inscribed, Florus failed to pay his share, which was probably made up by contributions from the two Savonii, but there was still hope that he would pay up, since space for his name was left on (b). All this could have taken place in two or three days, or, conceivably, a single day, while the altar was in production in the manufactory from which it had been ordered.

No Greek really confused the two: the hero's close association with a tomb was a constant reminder of his original mortality.

The closest analogy in our own culture is the Christian saint. There are significant differences, but both saint and hero achieve recognition on the basis of proven power, a power that the ordinary dead do not have and that is therefore in some sense supernatural. Again, while the vast majority of both saints and heroes derive from a shadowy and more or less legendary past, the number of known individuals who have achieved sainthood or heroic status in the clear light of history is not inconsiderable. The detection of an occasional intruder like the unique St. Demetra of Eleusis (a "faded" god?) or St. Orestes of Soracte (an etymological blunder?) is hardly sufficient to discredit the Christian doctrine of sainthood. The human origin of the Greek hero seemed to antiquity equally certain and undeniable.

Not so to modern scholarship. One hero after another has been identified as a "faded" god, as a purely fictional ancestor, or as one of innumerable "functional" divinities. Farnell's classic study distinguishes seven classes of heroes, of which only one or two would conform to the Greek belief. The divine origin of a Helen or a Hyacinthus does, indeed, seem clearly indicated by the evidence, and many eponymous heroes may well be "transparent fictions." But theories are heady things, and it is tempting to follow them with too great enthusiasm. Farnell is wisely sceptical of some of Usener's extremes, but even he is ready to dismiss a Daïtes or Deipneus as "obviously late creations." The well-known case of Dexion should be a warning. Were it not for the specific information we have, who would ever have suspected that the "Receiver" was in fact, not a "functional hero," but the heroized poet Sophocles? Where our information is so scanty, often little more than a name, it is surely hazardous to disregard the unanimous opinion of those to whom the heroes were a vital part of religion.

Brelich's study provides a refreshingly new approach. He says, in effect, "If the heroes are so heterogeneous in nature and origin, how are we to explain the fact that in the view of the classical period they formed a *particular* category, quite distinct from the category of gods, daimones, or ordinary humans?" Granted the nature of our evidence, which with few exceptions is inadequate for the individual case, Brelich sets out to discover what things are characteristic of the heroes as a class, and in particular to correlate recurrent elements of heroic myth with what we know of heroic cult practices. In so far as persistent features emerge, we can hope to gain insight into what, for the Greeks themselves, was typical of the heroes.

Before embarking on his systematic analysis, Brelich first illustrates the problem by considering the complex figure of Trophonius. Though Trophonius is never called a hero—indeed, in some inscriptions he is styled Zeus Trophonius—, his myth is exclusively human (i.e. heroic). His name clearly means "Nourisher," and it has therefore been assumed that he was a local god or daimon of fertility; yet his cult, so far as our evidence indicates, is primarily oracular. Trophonius was not an epic hero, and since his myths were not therefore subject to extensive literary revision we might look for a signifi-

cant connection of cult and myth. On the contrary this "Nourisher," whose cult is oracular, appears in myth as an architect, an arch-thief, and a murderer. Cult name, cult function, and myth are, so far as our sources go, totally incongruent. Farnell simply assumed that floating tales were attached to his name outside of Boeotia, and that the myth has no relevance to the cult. But in fact some of the persistent features of the myth seem securely localized, and since they have not been standardized or moralized through literary treatment they should be meaningful. If not specifically for the cult of Trophonius, are they, perhaps, meaningful for the hero as such?

Which are the recurrent themes of heroic myth and cults? Most prominent is that of the *Hero and Death*. A tomb is the normal locale of the cult; only rarely is the existence of a tomb denied. The sacrifice is commonly (though not exclusively) funereal in type, and there is often a complex ritual of mourning. In myth the heroes, with few exceptions, die, and many die violently or prematurely young. *Hero and Combat*. The heroes are above all warriors, and one of their most common functions is to protect their own city or people in war. Telamon and Ajax were invoked before the battle of Salamis; the Cretans sacrificed to Idomeneus and Meriones in war. Here myth and function do correspond. More significant, however, is the story in Herodotus (I, 67), that to defeat Tegea the Spartans must obtain the bones of Orestes. But Orestes had no fame as a warrior. The role ascribed to him rests simply on his status as a hero. Again, *Agonistic Contests* are closely associated with heroes. Besides the numerous games directly in their honor, heroes appear in one guise or another in many games dedicated to divinities (e.g. Pelops at Olympia, Opheltes at Nemea). Nearly all heroes were athletes, and many were founders of games or inventors of some special athletic skill. What is more, outstanding athletes, even in historical times, were heroized. Those who find it hard to reconcile the combination of religion and athletics would do well to ponder the words of Pausanias (V, 10, 1), who cites side by side the Eleusinian mysteries and the Olympic games as notable instances of divine concern. Closely allied to one another are the *Mantic* and *Healing* qualities of heroes, forming virtually a single art, *iatromantikê*. Such diverse heroes as Heracles, Odysseus, and Orpheus render oracles, while the oracular shrine of the seer Amphiaraus was in practice chiefly concerned with healing. Even athletic heroes, such as the famous Theagenes of Thasos, might become healers (Paus., VI, 11, 9).

Brellich's next two sections, on *Mysteries* and *Passage to Adulthood* show more tenuous and less convincing links with the heroes. And finally, his last three headings, *City-state*, *Blood-groups*, and *Human Activities* may well be considered together. Here we have the "founders," the inventors, and the "first men": virtually every human activity and institution has its heroic originator. Here Brellich makes two comments that are worth noting. The "inventions" ascribed to the heroes are, in general, those functional to human life; they do not include the later crafts, and no hero is worshipped exclusively by "trade" groups. The "inventions" relate either to the broad levels of human existence (e.g. agriculture, urban life) or to particular activities (e.g. war, oracles, slavery, agonistic) that are in themselves religiously significant or are basic to organized society.



This suggests that the patterns have very deep roots. The other point is that we are not justified, just because eponymous heroes are so frequent and because we encounter such cult-titles as *heros strategos* and *heros iatros*, in assuming that such heroes are *Sondergötter*, limited to a single function. Brelich's broad survey shows that no hero is functional in the sense that he has an *exclusive* link to any activity or concept. The limitation suggested by a transparent name or title need not mean that he does not have a "full" personality. The case of Trophonius (and of Dexion) is instructive. Where our information on individuals is so scanty, Brelich's "global" consideration proves its worth.

Morphologically, then, the heroes are, as a class, complex beings, wherever we have sufficient evidence to go on. Heracles seems to represent all the activities that are typical of heroes, but any or all of these may appear united in any given hero. So Aesclepius, both in cult and myth, is primarily a healer, but he displays as well many other heroic features: he suffers an extraordinary death; he has a tomb (or tombs) and his ritual is partly funerary-heroic; he appears as a warrior, and as a giver of oracles; he was initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries; he was a city-founder, and the ancestor of a group, the Aesclepiadae; he is associated with hunting. Is this mere poetic elaboration, or does it point rather, as Brelich thinks, to an original complex in which all these things were alike characteristic of the hero?

Typological consideration of heroic myth is also revealing. Far from being ideal, the heroes show many monstrous features. They may be gigantic or again dwarfs (Heracles appears in both guises); sometimes they show theriomorphic traits, or are sexually ambivalent. Deformities are common. They are gluttonous, oversexed, given to homicide, deceit, and trickery. That such traits persist in the myths even in the face of more developed *mores* suggests that they are original and basic. Abnormality is then a primary aspect of heroes.

Moreover, the heroes share many of their basic characteristics with the "mythical collectivities," the Centaurs, Cabiri, Cyclopes, Satyrs, etc., and with at least some gods (Hermes, Dionysus). But whereas the collectivities are primarily concerned with cosmogonic matters, the heroes are concerned with man's world. Heracles, the hero *par excellence*, by his conquest of immortality, typifies the quasi-immortal character of all heroes. He is ἥρως θεός.

Seen in this light, the hero is not, then, a being wholly distinct from god and man. The elements of similarity with the gods and the mythical collectivities point to a common origin. Even the gods, in the remote past, lived through periods of struggle and conflict, but once the cosmogonic process was complete, their immortality and blessedness was securely established. Considered *en bloc*, the heroes also belong to a mythical past, the time when human institutions were taking form. As men, they are necessarily imperfect and subject to death; their abnormality and ambivalence reflect the difficulties and perils of their unsettled times; but they are also superhuman in their creativity, by which the present age was brought into being. One of the primary aims of "archaic" religion is to perpetuate and guarantee the existing order. Greece could appeal to the creative and formative "heroic" age to give that order a sacred and immutable value.

Such, in broad outline, is Brelich's thesis. In detail one can point to errors of fact and interpretation, and at times the evidence seems to be pushed too far. There is a good deal of socio-religious jargon that the reader might have been spared, and at times even a certain unnecessary strain of arrogance. Yet in the main this is a persuasive and exciting book. The underlying pattern common to the vast majority of heroes emerges as something of a revelation, and the puzzling aspects of this or that individual cult begin to appear in a new light. Future studies will supplement, refine, and rectify Brelich's findings, but his approach to the problem is both original and sound, and the analyses that make up the heart of his study are a positive achievement. Though his conclusions, as he would himself admit, are necessarily tentative, at the least one can say that he faces squarely the question of the significance of heroic cult, and of its origins. Here, especially in the relation of the heroes to the "mythical collectivities," his work has points of contact with Hemberg's classic study, *Die Kabiren*, but where Hemberg is cautious and methodical, Brelich is impassioned and intuitive. One complements the other, and both succeed to a degree in illuminating the obscure processes through which Greek religion took its distinctive form. For this we may be sincerely grateful.

FRANCIS R. WALTON.

FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY.

E. BADIAN. *Foreign Clientelae* (264-70 B. C.). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958. Pp. xi + 342. \$8.00.

This is an important book. The author shows how the traditional Roman institution of *clientela*, with its connotations of superiority and inferiority and its obligations (extra-legal) of *beneficia* and *officia*, was so basic a part of the Roman way of thinking that the Romans unconsciously transferred this attitude from private life to their relations with communities in Italy and throughout the Mediterranean world. Also the relationships of *hospitium* and *amicitia*, which had both a private and public character and by definition implied equality, inevitably tended, as Roman power grew, to merge with the notion of *clientela* proper and "to fit into the requirements of *beneficium* and *officium* that form the moral basis of that category" (p. 13). Badian finds in this Roman habit of thought a key to the understanding of the nature of Roman imperialism. Although it would be unrealistic to argue that there is only one explanation for the phenomenal growth of Roman power throughout Italy and the Mediterranean basin, Badian, by a careful analysis of the evidence, proves his thesis that the institution of *clientela* and the habit of mind behind it were probably the most decisive factors in Roman imperialistic growth. He also shows clearly in the second half of the book the importance of *clientela* in and beyond Italy, from the time of the Gracchi on, for the rise to power of individual Romans and thereby for the breakdown of the republic.

Part One is entitled *Foreign Policy*. Badian begins with an excellent succinct discussion of the organization of Italy before the

Hannibalic War. In his treatment of alliances he argues successfully against the prevalent notion that the commonest type of treaty was the *foedus iniquum*. Even though many of the signatories were *in dicione populi Romani*, theoretically the majority of the allies were independent. In practice, however, the growth of Roman power caused most of the allies to become dependent on Rome, hence clients. Badian describes the cynical way in which, under the guise of morality, Roman influence spread as follows: "Rome claims, and successfully exercises, the right to extend her alliance to any free state and to protect it against its enemies, even if the attack actually preceded the alliance. Thus the principle of fetial law which prohibited aggressive wars was overcome and the legal form was developed which later permitted the conquest of the Mediterranean without clear infringement of this principle. And thus, also, Rome was to an increasing extent to acquire the reputation of the strong protector to whom weak nations most naturally appealed in their danger" (pp. 30-1). The cases of the Campanians in 343, of the Lucanians in 299, and of Thurii in 282 are to the point. Still more important is the case of the Mamertines in Messina, for here the protection of the *fides Romana* passed beyond the confines of Italy. Badian's defense of the Romans in this connection against the charge of immorality (pp. 34-5) may strike many as somewhat sophistical. The Mamertines received a *foedus*, but in the ensuing First Punic War, although many Sicilian cities went over to the Romans, none received a treaty. Badian argues that these were the original *civitates liberae*, although scholars have generally dated the first appearance of this category to 197 B. C. The position of a "free state" without a formal alliance with a great power may well have seemed an unusual privilege. History taught only too clearly the fate which awaited a small state allied with a strong protector. Badian believes that originally the freedom of these cities was not limited or precarious, just as the freedom subsequently conferred on the Hellenes was originally without limitations. "It is obvious that this grant was not, on the part of the Romans, an act of disinterested generosity. . . . Rome could afford to be generous and refrain from imposing formal obligations, because she knew that she would have a strong moral claim on the states concerned—and the power to remind them of it. Just as, after 338, the Latins had been left in a state of moral and practical, rather than strictly legal, dependence, so the *civitas libera* had no legal link with Rome . . . In this, its position is like that of the client as against his patron—and indeed, these cities had probably surrendered *in fidem populi Romani* and were free *beneficio populi Romani*—as it always to a large extent remained in Roman life: an extra-legal dependence of the weak on a strong protector, founded on gratitude, piety, reverence, and all the sacred emotions—and the patron's power to enforce them. . . . Rome's international relations cannot be analysed in terms of law alone: whatever their legal position, *all* states dependent on her became client states. And the relation of *clientela* is essentially extra-legal. If any state can, however, be called the *paradeigma* of the client state, it is the *civitas libera*—a state with no legal obligations at all. As we shall notice, the logical Greeks at first could not see beyond the law" (pp. 40-2).

Rome's interference in Illyria resulted from her protectorate over Italy, but, as often, Rome did not take action until she thought her own interests were at stake—on this occasion by the rise of a strong Illyrian power. The results of the First Illyrian War were important, for, among other things, they marked "the further development of the principle of association without treaty" (p. 45). Various Greek cities and Illyrian tribes became informal friends of Rome. Demetrius of Pharus, the strongest of these friends, presumably considering himself completely free, subsequently adopted an independent policy and one adverse to Roman interests. In the Second Illyrian War Rome quickly struck him down and gave "her friends a warning as to the limitations of their 'freedom.' The example of Demetrius, the ungrateful client, showed them the importance of remembering Rome's *beneficia*. The nature of political *clientela* was becoming clear: the client must not forget his station and the benefits he had received from Rome" (pp. 46-7; cf. Polybius, III, 16, 2).

Badian has a good discussion of Rome's fateful relations with Saguntum. He believes that after the Ebro treaty Rome received Saguntum into her *fides*. No treaty was made and hence the action probably should be considered a violation of the spirit rather than of the letter of the Ebro treaty. Thus Saguntum was in the category of those free states over which Rome assumed a protectorate so as to use them, if necessary, against a powerful enemy. In Badian's view Rome's great political discovery in the third century was this principle of the free client state. Such states because of their free status looked down on the subject allies. They formed, in a sense, "Rome's private *clientela*." Rome as protector of these free states had more freedom, than in the case of her allies, to decide when to supply protection, as Saguntum tragically learned. The case of Demetrius of Pharus showed that "the 'free' friend of Rome is free as long as Rome does not care. When she wishes to interfere, there will be formal pretexts—and above all, there will be the charge of ingratitude, justifying extreme measures. For the interpretation of the client's obligations rests largely—as in private *clientela*—with the patron. But the full realization of this was yet to come" (pp. 53-4).

Badian treats Rome's relations with the Greeks and Hellenistic kingdoms at considerable length (pp. 55-115). The discussion, as a whole, is excellent, although there are a few rather surprising judgments such as the following. The fact that Rome "refrained from intervening in the Social War in Greece" seems to be attributed to commendable restraint. One wonders what excuse even the Romans could have fabricated for intervention at that time. In several places Philip's treaty with Hannibal is referred to as a "stab in the back." That would be a natural Roman accusation, but it should be counterbalanced by mention of how the Macedonians must have viewed Roman interference in Illyria since 229. Also the characterization of Rome's demands on Philip which precipitated the Second Macedonian War as not harsh is somewhat startling. The comments on the significance of this ultimatum are so basic to the thesis of the book that they deserve to be quoted at some length. "In fact the Roman ultimatum is only a further extension of an old Roman political idea . . . ; just as, originally, Rome had invented a

method of evading the requirements of fetial law—that wars must be waged only in defence of one's own or of allied territory—by making alliances with, and thereby assuming 'legitimate' protection over, states actually facing attack, so now states were unilaterally taken under Roman protection without even the formality of a treaty . . . (The) practical effect was, of course, to do away with the last restrictions (except purely formal ones) which fetial law imposed upon policy. In the two generations since Roman armies first crossed the sea . . . there had grown up a system of informal connexion with free states, beginning in Sicily and further tested in Illyria, the elastic obligations of which fitted into the Roman habits of social thought which we know as 'clientela' and, while thus acquiring moral sanction, also fitted in well with the practical requirements of power politics. As this system was extended and became firmly established, it even transformed by its influence the earlier concept of *amicitia* . . . until the Romans could no longer imagine the co-existence of genuinely equal states: her *amici* could only be her clients" (p. 68).

There is neither space nor need in this review to discuss Badian's penetrating treatment of the complicated relations between Rome and the east from 200 to 146. Throughout this period Roman policy continued to be chiefly dictated by the concept of *clientela*, and many of the tragic situations arose from the Greek inability to comprehend the extra-legal aspects of this institution. After 146 "all allies—'free' or 'federate'—are clients, in the sense that their rights and obligations are in practice independent of law and treaties and are entirely defined and interpreted by Rome" (p. 114). The term *socii* came closer and closer to the meaning of *subjects*.

In Part Two, *Internal Politics*, the emphasis shifts from the clients of the *Populus Romanus* to "the network of personal links between great Roman individuals and families and individuals, families and states outside the City" (p. 154). These ties were generally established as a result of victory in war or of administrative contacts. Badian emphasizes that "the main point was that, in exchange for *beneficia* received and expected, the community undertook the *officia* of a client"; he then proceeds to give an interesting list of typical *beneficia* and *officia* (pp. 160-5). These last chapters present a skillful analysis of certain aspects of Roman political history from the time of the Gracchi through the first consulship of Pompey. In keeping with the thesis of the book attention is focused on the rôle played by *clientelae*, Italian and foreign. Particularly interesting are the accounts of Marius' professional army and of the opportunities thus opened up to a general born without hereditary *clientelae* and of Sulla's greater grasp of these possibilities and his efforts to perpetuate the influence of the professional army by surrounding Rome with various colonies of his veterans. By this time *clientela* had become an instrument of *δυναστεία*. The institution continued to be a great source of *dignitas* but also, increasingly, of *invidia*. Pompey, the young war lord from Picenum, early in life realized the potentialities of *clientelae*, both Italian and foreign, and it is to his career prior to his eastern campaigns that the last chapter is largely devoted. In these pages Badian makes good use of prosopographical evidence; see also Appendix B.

Badian's book is a difficult one to review adequately because it contains such a wealth of material and is so closely reasoned. Another review would be necessary to do justice to Part Two. As he states in the Preface, he owes much to predecessors such as Syme, Sherwin-White, Gelzer, and Münzer, but he has succeeded better than any historian I know in elucidating the fundamental significance of the institution of *clientela* in Roman foreign policy and internal politics. Scholars will surely hope that he will be able to continue his study of *clientela* down to the establishment of the Principate. One conclusion to which such a continuation would lead he has already suggested (p. 262; cf. p. 166). "The mystery of the cohesion of the Empire through successive civil wars, and despite manifest misgovernment, now becomes more intelligible. The Empire was based on the personal loyalty of leading men throughout the provinces to leading families at Rome, and this attachment proved to be independent of political vicissitudes and, as we have seen, on the whole unaffected even by the fortunes of those families. It was the foundation on which the emperors were to build."

JOHN V. A. FINE.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

WALTER NEUHAUSER. *Patronus und Orator: Eine Geschichte der Begriffe von ihren Anfängen bis in die augusteische Zeit.* Innsbruck, Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1958. Pp. 210. (*Commentationes Aenipontanae*, XIV.)

Dr. Neuhauser concludes that in the Ciceronian period, *patronus* came to be used most frequently in the sense of legal pleader on behalf of another and thus was equivalent to *orator* in its forensic meaning. To prepare the ground for this conclusion, he carefully analyzes the history of the significance of both terms. The sections devoted to each open with an etymological study. That on *patronus* brings out its relation to *pater* and *patria potestas*. Presumably in the earliest period, a *patronus* had actual mastery over his clients, whether these were individuals, groups, or communities, just as the *pater* had over his *familia*. However, the patron, like the father, also had obligations towards his clients and with the passage of time the concept of mutual obligation came in the relationship of patron and client to overshadow that of mastery.

In the middle and late republic, the most frequent demand made upon the patron by his clients was to appear in court on their behalf. In early court procedure, the most important element was a knowledge of the formal (and often inequitable) rules and procedures of the civil law so that the patron was primarily expected to contribute technical legal knowledge. From the middle of the second century B. C., Roman law and procedure began to be liberalized in the direction of equity so that rhetorical skill in presenting the justice and reasonableness of a case became more important than ability to fit it into the formalities of the civil law. Thus by Cicero's day, the patron in court had to be a pleader of oratorical rather than of legal

ability. This line of argument is supported by a thorough consideration of the occurrences of *patronus* in literature. At the end of the study there is a list of all the passages discussed. Readers will, perhaps, find most interesting the varied meanings of the term in Plautus and the fact that the only instance cited from Cato the Elder refers to a *patronus* in court.

The treatment of *orator* depends almost wholly on its literary employment. Though it had a number of significances (all derived from *orare*) in every period, its most frequent use before Cicero appears to have been for an ambassador or representative speaking on behalf of another. Cicero, translating into Latin Greek rhetorical theory, emphasized the concept of the *orator* as a public speaker, and particularly as a pleader in court. Hence in Cicero the common meanings of the two words overlapped. A *patronus* was pre-eminently an *orator* pleading in court on behalf of another who, in consequence, became his client even if he had not been so already in the more extended and older relationship. This relationship of lawyer and "client" has survived into modern legal parlance.

Though Neuhauser ends his detailed analysis with the Augustan period, he sketches the history of the two words under the empire and, for *orator*, even into the middle ages, using the conclusions of P. Benedikt Hermann, *Zur Wortbedeutung von orator im Frühmittelalter usw. (Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens, N. F. XVI [1929])*. Under the early empire, the meanings of the two terms again drew apart. The original concept of the patron's general responsibility for the welfare of his clients had not been lost sight of during the later republic. Indeed, it was then important both socially and politically for a patron to be attended both at his morning receptions and in public by a large crowd of obsequious clients. The social importance of clientship in the early empire appears in the frequent references in such writers as Martial, Pliny the Younger, or Juvenal, particularly to the "hand-out" or *sportula*, usually food commuted to cash, given by the patron to his clients.

Tacitus' *Dialogus* shows how, at the same time, the empire reduced the scope of rhetorical display in court pleading and restored importance to technical knowledge of the law. Hence the man called on to plead in court on behalf of another came to be denominated *advocatus* and either to be himself a person learned in the law, a *iurisconsultus* or *iurisprudens*, or to base his arguments on opinions received from such. *Orator* continued to be used generally for pleader, public speaker, or representative, but no longer had the specific meaning of pleader which Cicero had attached to it. Hence the connection of both *patronus* and *orator* with pleading in court and therefore their identification of meaning came to be lost sight of.

So detailed a treatment as this will appeal chiefly to those specifically concerned with social or legal aspects of Roman studies. For such, Neuhauser presents a thorough survey of both ancient and modern materials. His general conclusions will also bear upon such studies as that of E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae: 264-70 B.C.* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958). Badian argues that Roman foreign policy was conditioned by the concept of the patron-client relation and that her expectation of "services" from allied or subject

states, acceptable to her Italian allies, was alien to the diplomacy of the Hellenistic world and caused constant misunderstandings between Rome and eastern powers. Mention may also be made in connection with Neuhauser's book of one which C. G. Starr reviewed in *A. J. P.*, LXXX (1959), pp. 216-17, namely Louis Harmand, *Le patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire*, etc. (Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1957). Harmand analyzes the concept of patronage, both of Augustus (but not of succeeding emperors) and of private individuals, over communities.

MASON HAMMOND.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

ERNST PULGRAM. *The Tongues of Italy*. Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1958. Pp. xi + 465.

Few scholars could have written a book which not only covers the linguistic history of Italy from the earliest Latin remains to the present day but extends back in time over the period ante-dating the spread of Latin and even to the first entry of man himself into Italy. Ernst Pulgram has the necessary familiarity with both the ancient languages and Italian, supplemented on the one hand by a thorough understanding of the principles of historical linguistics and on the other by an intimate knowledge of the country of Italy itself. As a result he has produced a work from which professional scholars can learn much and which non-technical readers can study with profit and with an enjoyment due in part to the fervent spirit which appears in many of its pages. At the same time, however, the reader may feel some surprise at the great scarcity of actual linguistic material treated. On page 250 some of the most typical Sabine loans in Latin are listed, but citations of linguistic forms and accounts of changes in grammatical structure are rare. Throughout the book the author's concern is with the external rather than the internal history of the languages of Italy, so much so, in fact, that what we have is really an account of the speakers of the tongues of Italy rather than of the tongues themselves. Palmer's *Latin Language* and the present work could be used as supplements to one another: Palmer has more phonological, morphological, and lexical data, while Pulgram has more anthropology, archaeology, and Roman political and social history.

There are four major divisions of the book: Modern Italy, Pre-Roman Italy, Roman Italy, and Mediaeval Italy. Among the various Italian dialects Pulgram considers Tuscan closer than other dialects to Latin, though on grounds which he admits are impressionistic and not susceptible of scientific demonstration; and he takes care to point out that this closeness to Latin could only have operated among the highly educated as a factor in determining the selection of Tuscan as the standard dialect (p. 59). At the same time he upholds the importance of Dante, together with Petrarch and Boccaccio, in advancing the selection of Tuscan.

It is difficult here, because of limitations of space, even to sum-

marize the comprehensive account of Pre-Roman Italy, which reaches back beyond the first remains of palaeolithic man in Italy to the beginnings of man himself. But it is possible to select for mention or discussion certain portions of Book Two which have a particular interest for students of the ethnology and languages of early Italy. The author attributes the introduction of Indo-European dialects into Italy to the invaders who introduced copper, bronze, and iron, reflected respectively in the palafitte, terramare, and Villanova cultures, with the warning that these invasions had rather the nature of slow infiltrations, and that we should not assume that all persons in possession of these cultures were Indo-European speakers. Metal cultures from the Near East entered Italy by a southern as well as a northern route, and the combination of the two immigrations had the character of a pincer movement, the northern and southern prongs of which had for a time little contact with each other. The bearers of the southern culture are to be regarded as non-Indo-European in speech. The theory of von Duhn regarding the cremating Italic of the northwest and the inhuming Italic of the southeast, and the Rome-Rimini line which separates them, is examined (pp. 219-23) and discarded because it does too much violence to linguistic groupings, especially the close grouping of Oscan and Umbrian, because it fails to explain the absence of inhumation burials in the northern area which the inhuming Italic are supposed to have traversed, and because there is too great a gap in time between the time of the iron-age burials and the earliest dialect records. In discussing the relationship between Latin and Oscan-Umbrian, which must inevitably arise in a work of this kind, he dissents from those who find common features in a "proto-Italic" dialect spoken in the original Indo-European home and regards Latin and the Italic dialects as largely the product of developments occurring on Italian soil, with the influence of distinct substrata responsible for many of their peculiarities and cultural contact for many features which they possessed in common. Here his interpretation of the evidence agrees with the opinions of several recent scholars, especially in Italy, while at the same time he emphasizes the analogy with the development of the Romance languages, whose peculiarities are to be accounted for by the substrata upon which Latin was superimposed rather than by dialectal features already present in Latin before its spread. To the Etruscan question, the importance of which in a book of this kind is obvious, he devotes a full chapter. Recognizing the striking resemblance of the language of the Lemnian stele to Etruscan, and the inevitability of admitting the existence of bearers of an orientalizing art and an orientalizing religion into the Etruscan culture as we know it in Italy, he ranges himself with the majority who regard the language as a non-Indo-European importation from the Anatolian-Aegean, but at the same time he considers that we must regard the Etruscan culture known to us in Italy within the historic period as largely a native product; here he admits at least a measure of soundness in the position of Pallottino and others who regard the Etruscans as "autochthonous."

Not only in the Etruscan chapter is there a warning against the theories of those who, by forcing the evidence, have sought to interpret the texts and classify the language, but at many points in the

book one can find skepticism, and sometimes ridicule, toward theses with a plausible appearance but an insecure foundation. Here we may include on the one hand the common failure to recognize the fact that language, race, and culture are not necessarily coextensive, and on the other the misuse of linguistics and related disciplines for the purpose of supporting nationalist ideologies. Other examples of doctrines dismissed as incapable of demonstration, if not downright invalid, include Huntington's over-exact application of his theory of climatic cycles to Roman history (p. 24); the alleged "Mediterranean language" and the linguistic fossils used to support it (pp. 106-7); the geographical distribution of the beech tree as a means of fixing the home of the proto-Indo-European speakers (p. 145), without, however, any mention of the more recent and less well-known attempt to place it with reference to the occurrence of salmon in the rivers of northern Germany; the linguistic connections and physical characteristics of the Ausones and other little-known ethnic groups of ancient Italy (pp. 162-3); racial theories to explain the patrician-plebeian dichotomy (p. 259). Scholars who have carefully read *The Tongues of Italy* can scarcely fail to exercise greater care than previously in handling problems in which linguistics and ethnology interpenetrate.

In the chapter entitled "The Spread of Latin" the colonies and the roads are taken as the two means whereby Italy gradually became Roman. For the question why Rome did not forcibly compel its subject peoples to adopt the Latin language he gives several answers involving practical motives on the part of the Romans themselves. It seems likely, however, that a stronger reason may have been the impossibility of any systematic attempt to enforce linguistic assimilation in the manner in which some modern governments have attempted to enforce it through universal education and mass media of communication. As to the type of Latin which ultimately spread through the empire, Pulgram takes account both of the linguistic cleavage which must have accompanied the wide difference of social classes in Rome, and of the relatively humble, often non-Roman, background of the veterans who largely composed the colonates. He accepts the commonly held view that features of the ancient Italic dialects have persisted in the modern dialects of Italy, but he gives no examples.

Errors of citation and typography are next to non-existent. On p. 321, footnote 12, the first word of the Praenestine fibula is MANIOS, not DUEÑOS. On p. 358 the year of Cicero's birth should be given as 106.

There is a very full bibliography, broken down into sections corresponding to the eight "parts" (not the four "books"), each section being further divided into "cited" and "additional" categories.

JAMES W. POULTNEY.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

JOHN CHADWICK. *The Decipherment of Linear B*. Cambridge, University Press, 1958. Pp. x + 147; 2 pls.; 17 figs. \$3.75.

This book is designed primarily for the general reader, as a non-technical counterpart to Ventris and Chadwick's monumental *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (Cambridge, 1956). It is an excellent book; not only thoroughly competent, as one would expect from an author with Chadwick's qualifications, but also written in a lucid, fast-moving style which makes for very good reading. After a book like this, one wishes sincerely that more scholars with recognized standing in their fields would find it worth their while to acquaint a wider public with their problems and their results instead of leaving the important task of "popularization" of scholarship to journalists and professional writers who by necessity have to rely too heavily on second-hand information too hastily acquired.

For his professional colleagues, Chadwick prefaces his book with a warning (p. x): "this book is not for them, though I hope they will enjoy reading it." This reviewer did indeed enjoy the book, but he cannot help considering the disclaimer of scholarly value as an understatement. True, the book does not contain a formidable apparatus of footnotes and bibliographical references; but the mere fact that its core, chapters 2-6, offers a much more complete account of the steps leading to the decipherment than that found in *Documents* (let alone in "Evidence for Greek Dialect in the Mycenaean Archives" [*J.H.S.*, LXXIII, 1953, pp. 84-103]), makes this book a very useful item for the scholar interested in Mycenaean problems. The account of the trial-and-error approach shows one thing very clearly, which sometimes tends to be overlooked: the solution was arrived at by a combinatorial, not a statistical method; statistics has its place in the assessment of the odds for mere chance "identifications," but not in the basic discovery procedure. An exception to such an evaluation of the approach can be found only in the conjectures made about the "pure vowel" signs (p. 52). Here it is not without a certain irony that these conjectures did indeed lead to the right conclusions even though they were based on faulty assumptions: high frequency of "pure vowels" in initial position and almost complete absence of vowel clustering in the interior of forms is by no means a general distributional property of all languages, but rather of some undetermined number of languages only, of which Greek happened to be one.

The nature of the book under review makes it unfeasible to take up here any of the points of controversy mentioned by the author; instead, only a few matters of detail are added, which may deserve consideration for later editions of this book. P. 21: cuneiform signs can hardly be said to consist of "only three wedge-shaped strokes." P. 34: instead of "in certain Germanic languages including English" read "in the Germanic languages." P. 102: generalizations about the use of a foreign language for recording purposes will also have to take into account such developments as the use of Prakrit, not the literary Sanskrit, as the language of official documents in Central Asia in areas with highly developed literary languages of their own (Saka and 'Tocharian' B).

WERNER WINTER.

PIERRE LÉVÊQUE. *Pyrrhos*. Paris, E. De Boccard, 1957. Pp. 735; 7 pls. (*Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, fasc. 185.)

King Pyrrhus of Epirus remains one of the most enigmatic, as well as one of the most interesting, figures in the history of Greece and Macedonia after the death of Alexander and of Italy in the age of the Roman conquest: the great tactician who could not use his victories, a tradition at least as old as Ennius, the eager adventurer who could not finish his undertakings, the disorderly and sometimes cruel enemy in Greece who is Rome's almost unique example of a chivalrous foe. He emerges from the pages of our chief source, Plutarch, and the other, more fragmentary ones, inconsistent in personality, policies, and achievements. Lévéque's attempt to find the unity behind these contradictions has produced a thorough and even exhaustive biography, of prime importance for its comprehensive and critical handling of difficult material.

A large initial section is rightly devoted to the sources, and lays the basis for a considerable amount of detailed analysis in the later sections of the work, for though late and often confused, they retain material from contemporary or early hands, in Greece from Hieronymus of Cardia, Pyrrhus' own Memoirs, Proxenus, Timaeus, and in Rome from Ennius and the earlier and later annalists. In Epirus inscriptions and coins make only a minor contribution. In spite of the author's skill in analysis doubts may remain when the early material preserved is so slight. How probable is it that the sober Hieronymus, who pictures Pyrrhus as the restless destroyer when he opposed the Antigonids, would heroise him when he faced the Roman barbarians? In fact he probably used that same restlessness to motivate the western adventure (pp. 25 ff.). Can so much be attributed to Proxenus on the basis of a single fragment? That he was an intimate of Pyrrhus remains a conjecture, however reasonable; and if so, the attribution to him of the stories of Pyrrhus' childhood and his thoughts and sayings are conjectures too. Ennius' part in the formation of the Roman tradition may be greater and more reliable than the author grants (pp. 45 ff.). After all, his Messapian forebears were allies of Pyrrhus and Tarentum in the war (p. 304), however hostile their previous sentiments toward the Greeks may have been. Tenney Frank's "brillante hypothèse" still has much in its favor. Perhaps more distinction should be made between the earlier and the later Roman annalists. And while the author attributes one passage in Plutarch (p. 12) to moralists he treats the conversation between Cineas and Pyrrhus (p. 14) before the departure for Italy as early and in essentials genuine (pp. 276, 289-92).

The greater part of the book takes up in turn the three great chapters of Pyrrhus' career: his activities in Greece and Macedonia up to the Italian expedition, his wars in Italy and Sicily, his wars in Macedonia and Greece after his return from Italy, and there are frequent and full appendixes on individual questions such as those relating to genealogy, chronology, and coinage. While the author admits the presence of a great ambition he finds evidence at each stage of political as well as military capacity and denies that the

major decisions were impulsive or unconsidered. Pyrrhus did first enlarge, strengthen, and enrich the little Epirot kingdom to which he returned in 297 (pp. 183 ff.), even though his later enterprises meant years of absence and some neglect. Yet his expulsion from Macedonia and Thessaly in 285 was more a political than a military defeat (pp. 176 ff.). Nor was his western venture decided on impulse. There elapsed a year of consultation and preparation between the invitation from Tarentum and his departure (pp. 261, 285 ff.). Rejecting the view that Pyrrhus was simply a condottiere, the author presents him both as a crusader for Hellenism against the barbarians (p. 279) and the intended creator of a vast western power (p. 262; cf. pp. 423 ff., 470 ff., on his coinage). And if he failed he was not the only man to discover the difficulties of leading a coalition or subduing the stubbornness of the Roman Senate. His departure for Sicily, again after months of reflection, was no abandonment of his Italian allies (he left forces in Tarentum and Locri) but a means at once of fulfilling his ambition and mobilizing strength to force a decision in Italy (pp. 420 ff.). Stopped at Lilybaeum after his successes in Sicily, he planned an expedition to Africa in order to complete his task in Sicily, and when the Sicilians refused to co-operate he returned to Italy to aid his allies there (pp. 491 ff.). When he returned to Epirus after Beneventum he did not abandon the Tarentines but left forces and officers who remained there until his death in 272. His hope was to recoup in Macedonia and Greece the means of renewing his western plans (pp. 531 ff.). His Peloponnesian expedition was not an act of grace to Cleonymus but was intended to complete the overthrow of Antigonus Gonatas and let him return to the west with force enough to win (pp. 578 ff.). The whole was ruined by his death at Argos in 272. This reconstruction of necessity involves too much emphasis on unaccomplished plans, yet it has some basis at each stage in our sources and is commended by the degree of consistency it brings into the picture of Pyrrhus himself.

Some points remain uncertain. The author holds that losses neither at Heracleia or at Ausculum justify the anecdote about a "Pyrrhic" victory (pp. 333 f.). His estimates of the rival forces and populations at the beginning of the war with Rome (pp. 312 f.) make them nearly equal, while those of Afzelius, which he does not mention, give the Romans a decided advantage (*Die römische Eroberung Italiens* (340-264 B.C.), pp. 186 ff., in *Acta Jutlandica*, XIV, 3 [1942]); and he stands in general with L. Breglia on the dating of the early Roman coinage (pp. 440 ff.). But one cannot fail to draw attention to the excellent discussion of the significance for Rome of the war with Pyrrhus (pp. 540 ff.) and the wealth of information in the Appendixes.

T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON.

MANFRED NEUMANN. *Die poetische Gerechtigkeit in der neuen Komödie: Untersuchungen zur Technik des antiken Lustspiels.* Speyer, 1958. Pp. 192. (Dissertation Mainz.)

As one should expect of a dissertation prepared under the direction of Thierfelder and Marg, the work of Neumann is thorough and competent. His book contains 940 footnotes. He is commendably well informed in the field of New Comedy, and he shows judiciousness in regard to contamination. His subject is one of prime importance. From the point of view of higher criticism, however, neither this work nor any other with which the reviewer is acquainted can be considered a satisfactory treatment of Poetic Justice in ancient drama.

Neumann examines every character in extant New Comedy to determine to what degree deserts are received. He discovers (p. 178) that Poetic Justice, especially in regard to the main characters, is an important principle of dramatic technique. He admits some modifications. Where punishment is deserved, there is a general tendency to forgive, especially to forgive characters sympathetically presented, and we are likely to be sympathetic to youth, beauty, and cleverness. Indeed even those who deserve no pity are often forgiven. He also states (p. 181): "Die Grundregel der poetischen Gerechtigkeit gilt auch für die Posse: der Sünder wird bestraft und der Gute belohnt. Allerdings wird der Begriff des "Sünders" etwas anders bestimmt als in den übrigen Stückchen. . . ."

Two points here are noteworthy. As soon as one changes his definition of "der Sünder" he in reality changes his principle. Secondly, the procedure of examining each character without bringing together all the characters of a given play results in a loss of the distinctive characteristics of each play. Actually there is wide variation among the plays in regard to Poetic Justice.

Most of the comedies of Menander are characterized by romantic emotionalism and a bland—not to say blind—optimism. In the *Andria* Pamphilus gives a promise to his father that contradicts his commitment to Glycerium, but his honor is saved by the long arm of coincidence. In the *Epitrepontes* Charisius suffers his conversion before he knows the true identity of the baby. He too is saved by the happy turn of events. In the *Perikeiromene* Agnoia explains that she has brought about the turbulent events in order that enlightenment may follow (cf. Neumann, p. 30). In short, chance itself seems benign in Menander's cosmos.

In no comedy is Poetic Justice more dominant than in the newly discovered *Dyskolos*, where the good are rewarded and enriched—for their goodness, as they themselves admit (*Dys.*, 644-772, 815-20, 862). Even the cook recognizes the triumph of Poetic Justice (*Dys.*, 644):

οὐδὲ εἷς

μά]γειρον ἀδικήσας ἀθῶος διέφυγεν.

The play is saved from becoming utterly flat by its winsome humor. Another saving grace is the choler of the old man. He has been "punished" for his boorishness, but his stubborn character is over-

come only by external compulsion in the farcical scene at the end of the play.

But even Menander occasionally lapses into a more honest outlook, as in the *Adelphoe*. Neumann has difficulty here. He (pp. 172-3) thinks that Micio should win out in the end, but that actually Demea, who earlier has been ridiculed, triumphs. Neumann's rejection of the usual opinion—which is the correct one—that the ending of this play involves a compromise seems to be based on a serious misinterpretation of vs. 994:

haec reprehendere et corrigere me et [öb]secundare in loco.

This does not mean "... tadele, verbessere und euch auf diese Weise helfe. . . ." The first and second infinitives in the Latin line constitute Demea's old policy of severity, the third infinitive represents Micio's policy of concession.¹ Demea is obviously proposing a compromise. Nor is Neumann (p. 75) correct in viewing Micio as the ideal father. It is obvious from the first of the play that Micio has been much less successful than he thinks and that Aeschinus is a somewhat callow and inconsiderate young man.

But in some comedies satire and cynicism dominate, and there is little or no soft romanticism. In general Poetic Justice is the principle of melodrama. Of course it has no place in great tragedy, which is constructed upon the precisely opposite principle: the pathetic discrepancy between what man does and what he suffers. It is true, however, that even in tragedy we cannot bear the spectacle of a perfectly good man coming to dire misfortune. This we view as accidental, and great tragedy must appear inevitable. We insist upon some faint hope of moral law and order, some degree of responsibility.

Neumann's efforts to apply his principle in such plays as the *Menaechmi* or the *Pseudolus* or the *Truculentus*, therefore, are mistaken. The true principle of the *Truculentus* is *ridentem dicere verum* or perhaps to hold up vice to ridicule. If we must bring it into relation with Poetic Justice, the proper application lies not, as Neumann thinks (p. 114), in the attractiveness of Phronesium's youth, beauty, and cleverness. Actually Phronesium is not very clever. The proper application lies precisely in the fact that vice and not virtue triumphs in the play: here is a very real Circe turning men into swine. It is futile to conjecture with Neumann (pp. 39-40) that Strabax will be driven away as soon as he can pay no more and that he will deserve such treatment because he has not observed the proper *pietas* towards his parents. So Neumann (p. 44) is mistaken in finding that in the *Pseudolus* Calidorus' reluctance to offend *pietas* serves to make him deserving of forgiveness. Actually this reluctance is imaginary.

Erotium in the *Menaechmi* Neumann (p. 133) calls "die am wenigstens sympathische Hetäre der Komödie" and (p. 134) he says: "Diese Bestrafung hat sie verdient, da sie nur habgierig, nicht aber schlau ist." Resentment against the theft of what she has been given for services rendered can hardly be called avariciousness.

¹ Whether one reads *obsecundare* or *secundare* in this line, the meaning is obviously the same as *obsecundato in loco* in *Heauton*, 827.

The *Menaechmi* and the *Pseudolus* are farces and the *Truculentus* a satirical comedy, all written with spirit and wit and a cold cynical detachment which leaves no place for Poetic Justice.

At times Neumann frankly and rightly admits that what happens to a given character is not pertinent to Poetic Justice. So (p. 55) he remarks that Stichus and Sangarinus are allowed their celebration less out of considerations of justice than because celebration is the order of the day. But at times Neumann strains too far. Syrus in the *Adelphoe*, he intimates (p. 57), may have his faults; but he has been made a sympathetic character before he is freed. On the contrary, the very point of the freeing of Syrus lies in the fact that he does not deserve it: Demea is reducing urbanity to the absurd.

Neumann (p. 17) thinks that Ampelisca in the *Rudens* is presented as freeborn. This seems to put too much weight on the plural *liberas* in vs. 736 (note *civis tuas* in vs. 742). Since Trachalio does not know the *patria* of Ampelisca (cf. vs. 750), he can hardly know that she was born free.

Despite these criticisms, we should be grateful to Neumann for his extended study on this important subject.

PHILIP WHALEY HARSH.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.

RICHARD M. HAYWOOD. *The Myth of Rome's Fall*. New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., Inc., 1958. Pp. 178. \$3.50.

The title of this book is rather misleading. From it one might infer that the volume seeks to demonstrate the truth of the oft-made assertion that the Roman Empire did not in fact fall at all, but, like the old soldier, merely faded away. This, however, is not the purpose of the book. Rather it seeks to show that misconceptions exist about the reasons for the disintegration of the Empire. Consequently an apter title for it would be "Myths concerning Rome's Fall." In any case the title leaves one in no doubt that this is a "popular" book; and, as such, it abounds in audacious assertions, arresting analogies, common clichés, oversimplifications, selectiveness and disproportion in its use of material, considerable compression, allusiveness in place of straight narrative. These are all, so to speak, tricks of the trade. They are unavoidable in a work of this type; and if it be granted that there is room and need in North America for a popular book on the subject (and seeing that over thirty years have elapsed since White's *Why Rome Fell* appeared, Haywood may well be right in arguing [p. 1] that there is), then one cannot reasonably criticize the author for the methods he has chosen to adopt. The methods do, of course, involve certain risks; but Haywood is a competent enough scholar to be quite well aware of them. There is always the lurking peril of the misstatement of fact: Haywood does not always avoid it (e.g. on p. 72 he makes the Cimbri and Teutoni threaten Italy in the time of Augustus rather than in the time of Marius), but he usually manages to do so; on the whole he adroitly displays the most admirable skill in introducing so much

so accurately in so small a compass. An even bigger hazard, however, is the risk of misleading, and this risk is directly proportionate to the amount of information likely to be possessed by the reader. Haywood is confessedly (p. 1) writing for the general reader; but the general reader, like the abominable snowman, is a pretty elusive animal. On the whole one gets the impression that the reader Haywood has in mind is not a very knowledgeable one: time and again he resorts to the "folksy" note (archaeologists are "the scholars who go out and get their hands dirty," p. 3) or, in the manner of Durant's *Caesar and Christ*, to the spicy (Commodus' "gazelle-eyed, bell-voiced houris," p. 53). A general reader who is likely to be impressed by this sort of thing is also only too likely to form wrong ideas when told (p. 15) that "the encirclement of the Mediterranean by Roman possessions was completed by the conquest of Egypt," or (p. 140) that "schismatic struggles within the Church had largely ceased by the end of the fourth century," or (p. 145) that from the fourth century on "history fell into two great periods, that before Christ and that after Christ." In order to find space for a rather more exact exposition of such points it might have been better to eschew the repetitions (e.g. those on Alaric [pp. 100, 156], on Augustine [pp. 134, 136], on Clovis [pp. 163, 168]) and the irrelevancies (e.g. the excursus on the Olympic Games [pp. 138-9]).

Much more serious, however, than the cavils that can be raised against Haywood's way of writing up his facts are the criticisms that can be made against his interpretation of them. His view is that it is incorrect or, to use his own favorite word, unrealistic, to think that the Empire in the West fell because there was something rotten in the state of Rome: the fall was not inevitable, it was the chance result of fortuitous contingency, a sort of historical freak. There was no "trait clearly indicative of ill health and premonitory of decay and dissolution" (p. 149); there were no conditions to cause "the subtle and deadly miasma which historians have so often assumed" (p. 154). This conviction leads him into making assertions which, in some instances, strike the present reviewer as wildly improbable, if not preposterous. The loss of material resources in the third century, when, we are assured (p. 60 and elsewhere), there was not really any anarchy, is airily dismissed (p. 108) as "a minor factor in the financial problem of the fourth century." Nor is there any "way of demonstrating that the method of public finance was a cause of the events which led to the loss of the West" (p. 114). Although he admits that there was a drain of currency to the orient, he argues (p. 108 and elsewhere) that ultimately it all came back to buy products of the Empire (for all the world as if he were writing about modern paper currencies instead of gold and silver coins which can be melted down into bullion). The "barbarian" assaults are minimized: at worst they were "very heavy pressures from the outside," and in any case resistance to them "was not so poorly discharged that disaster was inevitable" (p. 149). Bureaucratic corruption, while "regrettable," was not "a cause of the loss of the West" (p. 150). Such statements, and a lot more like them, leave one with the impression that the troubles of the Late Empire were, so to speak, a mere passing breeze, the evil effects of which could have been easily avoided if only the Romans had not made a few mistakes

(p. 157) or had possessed a workable system for "the succession to the throne" (p. 73). In fact, for Haywood, the fourth century "may well be compared to the nineteenth century in England" (p. 141). At this point one feels inclined to quote his own words (p. 128) against him and point out that the features of nineteenth century England which he adduces for purposes of comparison are "weaknesses which a more penetrating analyst might have perceived to be the common weaknesses of mankind."

Haywood seems to the present reviewer to have confused "historical inevitability" of the type against which Isaiah Berlin has so recently and so cogently argued with the kind of inevitability that can reasonably be postulated as the direct consequence of some immediately prior event or action. Granted, *post hoc* does not always mean *propter hoc*; but it seems perverse to argue that the admitted failure of the Empire to "cope with the persistent problems of government" (p. 170) in the third century had little or no bearing on any malaise that may have existed in the fourth. None but the followers of a Spengler or a Toynbee will quarrel with the thesis that the fall of Rome was not, historically speaking, inevitable; but few will share the view that the events of the third century were not really disastrous and destined, *inevitably*, to have far more damaging consequences than the mere creation of temporary difficulties. In fairness it should be added that, whatever one may think of Haywood's judgement of the facts, he does at least record the facts. His "unrealistic" readers may not draw the same conclusion as he does from the fact that the numbers of the Germanic invaders of the Empire were exiguous, but he does draw attention to it (p. 157). In sum he can be said to have discharged fairly well his self-imposed task of "indicating what changes took place from age to age" (p. 5), but is considerably less satisfactory in explaining why those changes occurred.

Being "popular," the book is not equipped with documentation or bibliography. Its one concession to the academic fraternity is to include an index. Unfortunately, when tested, the index is found to leave out so many items as not to be very serviceable.

E. T. SALMON.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY, HAMILTON, ONTARIO.

OTTO SEEL. *Die Praefatio des Pompeius Trogus*. Erlangen, 1955.

Pp. 86. DM 8. (*Erlanger Forschungen*, Reihe A: Band 3.)

GIOVANNI FORNI. *Valore storico e fonti di Pompeo Trogus, I: Per le guerre greco-persiane*. Urbino, 1958. Pp. 221. L. 1500.

(*Pubblicazioni dell'Università di Urbino*, 7.)

These two monographs show a renewed interest in a Latin historian who has been rather widely neglected of late. Pompeius Trogus was by descent a Gaul, but he became a good Roman. His grandfather, a member of the tribe of the Vescontii, was given

Roman citizenship by Pompey in return for services rendered during the war against Sertorius; his uncle accompanied Pompey on the campaign against Mithradates; and his father assisted Caesar in the Gallic wars. Then, in the early years of Augustus' rule, Trogus published his *Philippic History*, a history of the world in 44 books, beginning with the early empires of the ancient Orient and coming down to his own day. Though never mentioned by contemporary writers, Trogus' book was used by Valerius Maximus, the elder Pliny, and others in the first century, and in the fourth century it achieved wide popularity. It was frequently quoted by other writers; the authors of the *Augustan History* twice bracketed Trogus with Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus, as one of the four bright lights of Roman historiography; Justin made his epitome which reduced the text to about one-fifth its original size (Seel dates this epitome about 300); and both Trogus and Justin were of great help to such Christian writers as Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, and Cassiodorus, who were then working out a Christian version of world history. The text of Trogus disappeared toward the end of the sixth century, but we still have the Epitome in full, and there are brief summaries of each book (the Prologi). Justin's epitome remained popular throughout the Middle Ages and was frequently used as a school text until the middle of the nineteenth century, by which time it had undergone more than 250 reprintings. During the last hundred years, however, it has received less attention.

Modern criticism of Trogus may be said to date from A. von Gutschmid's article, "Trogus und Timagenes," which appeared in 1882. This author argued that, since Trogus could not have written the history himself, he must have followed some Greek source, which Gutschmid identified as the work of an Alexandrian Greek named Timagenes. Since very little is known about this Timagenes—there is not even good evidence that he ever wrote a world history—Gutschmid's theory only confused and misled scholars regarding the importance of Trogus' work. His suggestion was in harmony, however, with the prevailing assumption that no Roman could possibly do more than ape a Greek model, and it therefore won wide acceptance, eventually finding its way into most manuals of Latin literature.

Nevertheless, this Timagenes theory always met with a certain amount of criticism, which reached its climax in the above-mentioned work by Otto Seel, who had already edited the Teubner edition of Justin (1935) and who has since published the fragments of Trogus (Teubner, 1956). Though nominally a study of the preface to the Epitome (31 lines), this 80-page monograph really is an important discussion of Trogus and his place in Roman historiography. Seel's criticisms of the Timagenes theory are thoroughly convincing; he shows that Trogus' vigorous anti-imperialism was wholly within the Roman tradition of Sallust and Tacitus (and Cato); he thinks that Trogus, like Vergil, wished to suggest that Augustus would soon inaugurate a new and better world order; and he seems to conclude that the author of the *Augustan History* was not far wrong in his judgment of Trogus' proper place among the Roman historians. However, Seel does not adequately explain why Trogus' contemporaries so completely ignored this able and patriotic historian who was a close associate of Caesar and Augustus.

Forni accepts Seel's conclusions as a foundation for his study of Trogius' sources and historical value, especially for the period of the Greco-Persian wars. In his opening chapter he lists and summarizes the views of scholars, from Gutschmid to Seel, who have written on Trogius, and he gives us a rather full account of Seel's contentions. He then proceeds to a detailed study of Justin's methods as an abbreviator, minutely comparing the Prologi with the Epitome. He shows that Justin did his work very mechanically, that he omitted long passages completely, and that he added nothing of his own. He was so colorless a person, in fact, that we may safely trust the Epitome as reflecting Trogius, save for the latter's more scholarly discussions of chronology and geography, and such literary embellishments as battle scenes, speeches, and character sketches. After completing these preliminary studies, Forni turns to a study of Trogius' sources and their use for the period of the Persian wars. He comes to the conclusion that, like other ancient historians, Trogius followed one source for one episode and then changed to another for the next, rarely blending the two sources, and that he preferred rhetorical writers such as Ephorus and Theopompus to the more restrained Herodotus and Thucydides. He concedes that the value of these sections as history is not great. Trogius is of value, not as a source from which modern writers can draw facts for their own narratives, but as a representative thinker of the Augustan age whose writings exercised a profound influence upon the historical thought of later times.

J. W. SWAIN.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS.

OSCAR E. NYBAKKEN. *Greek and Latin in Scientific Terminology*. Ames, Iowa, Iowa State College Press, 1959. Pp. xi + 321.

This book has a twofold objective, which is stated on the first page: "(1) to increase the student's facility in determining the meaning of scientific words by analyzing their structure, and (2) to encourage the student to establish sound nomenclatural criteria for himself and his profession." It may be used for supplementary work in courses in language or science, or it may serve as the basic textbook for courses in scientific terminology, although in the latter case, since the plan of the book does not call for a division into separate lessons, the instructor must work out his own lesson plan.

The aim is practical throughout, and it is not expected that the scientists and science students who use it will be concerned with certain distinctions familiar to specialists in Greek and Latin historical grammar except in so far as these distinctions have a bearing on clarity and orderliness in scientific terminology. To a grammarian it is rather disturbing to find the terms "ablaut" and "vowel-gradation" made to include *facere*: *deficere* and other instances of the specifically Latin vowel-weakening along with such true instances of ablaut as Gk. *pherein*: *phoros*. Of more immediately practical importance, however, is the omission of any explanation of the dissimilatory principle which leads to the use of *-aris* in place of *-alis* in making adjectives from nouns already containing an *l* (e. g., *animalis* but *ocularis*).

The middle portion, amounting to about one half of the entire book, is devoted to two word-lists, the first Greek, the second Latin, containing the prefixes, suffixes, numeral stems, and all the words of general vocabulary which have any importance as sources of medical and biological terms. Under the reference word **Daktylos*, for example, we find *ankylo daktylia*, *apodactylic*, *arachnodactyly*, *brachydactyilia*, *camptodactyly*, *dactylopteros*, etc. Asterisks are used in front of the more important vocabulary items as an aid to the instructor in the economy of his material. The emphasis throughout the book is on medicine, biology, and other closely connected sciences rather than on chemistry, physics, and mathematics. It is for this reason that, for example, the family of words from μέθυ including such chemically important terms as *methane*, *methyl*, etc., is not included here. The general word-lists, however, are very comprehensive, with 725 word-families from Latin and 885 from Greek, and in the opinion of this reviewer the author was right in presenting an abundance of words in preference to the alternative of few words and more explanatory matter. The lack of commentary really offers no difficulty for one who knows how to use the book as a whole. I have noted only one lexical item which might lead to confusion: *lethal* appears under the Latin heading **Let(h)um* and again under the Greek heading **Lethe*; the real source is *letum* with *h* introduced into the Latin spelling and English pronunciation apparently as a result of Varro's connection of the word with λήθη (*L. L.*, VII, 42).

The book contains a few misprints. Some involving linguistic material are: p. 25 *obvate* for *obovate*; p. 57 near the bottom *χόγχη* for *κόγχη*; p. 147 *φερμός* for *θερμός*; p. 151 *anthraconecrossi* for *anthraconecrosis*; p. 152 *Aracne* for *Arachne*; p. 157 *endochondral* for *endochondral*; p. 170 *olighoydramnion* for *oligohydramnion*. On p. 269 *ἀριστερός* is glossed as "right" instead of "left." On p. 274, if the word coined by Sanoaville de Lachèse for hysteria in the male was really "tarassis" and not "taraxis," the form should not have been cited with approval. More serious, because it involves a small category rather than a single word, is the derivation of the *-ia* in *lithiasis*, *helminthiasis*, etc., from the verbal stem meaning "heal"; the forms in question are rather verbal nouns to verbs in *-iáo* designating morbid conditions (e. g. *λιθίασις* beside *λιθιάω*).

But all these minor blemishes are of slight consequence in comparison with the positive merits of the book, which is well conceived, well arranged, and excellently adapted to the objectives set forth on the opening page. The sections on transliteration, pronunciation, combining vowels, on eponyms, and on codes and rules of scientific nomenclature are only a few of the sections having particularly great value. Special mention may be made of the seven pages on word-elements frequently confused. There are a good bibliography and a good subject-index; in view of the plan of the book a word-index is not needed. The book, even where it is not the basic text for courses in scientific terminology, will be indispensable as a supplementary work of reference, and it will be no less indispensable for scientists who to any extent are concerned with the terminology of their specialty.

JAMES W. POULTNEY.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

JOHN MAXWELL EDMONDS. *The Fragments of Attic Comedy*, after Meineke, Bergk, and Kock. Augmented, Newly Edited with their Contexts, and Completely Translated into English Verse. Volume II. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1959. Pp. 682. 70 Guilders.

It may be that the recent discovery and publication of Menander's early play, *Dyscolus*, will inspire a revival of interest in Attic Middle Comedy, since Menander, in this play at least, seems to have more points of contact with earlier comedy than we used to suppose. Under the circumstances, the almost simultaneous appearance of a newly edited text of all the fragments of Middle Comedy seems a happy coincidence. Nonetheless, your reviewer must admit that the reading through of the complete collection of fragments, for the purposes of this review, was singularly unrewarding. We have to deal with quotations from about 650 plays, by 49 poets; most of the citations come from Athenaeus, who claims to have read 800 complete Middle Comedies. (One wonders why!) Most of the fragments have to do with eating and drinking; rare fish and exotic recipes abound. Whether this fact reflects merely the interests of Athenaeus, or a special tendency of this type of comedy, does not much matter. The result is the same in any case: we are almost completely in the dark about subject-matter, plot-construction, characterization, and other matters in which literary criticism involves the possession of entire works. Unfortunately, titles are only moderately helpful in revealing subject-matter: e. g., there is always the possibility that a title suggesting straight mythological burlesque may conceal political or social satire, as in Cratinus' *Dionysio-Alexandros*, or Aristophanes' *Plutus*. While mythological titles are frequent (over 150 out of the 650 known titles), still this is a smaller proportion than in Old Comedy (about 95 out of 300 titles). The common belief that there was a great increase of mythological burlesque in Middle Comedy needs revision.

The work under review here is the promised second volume of a proposed three-volume edition of the complete Attic Comic fragments. Shortly after the appearance of Volume I, Mr. Edmonds died (on March 18, 1958) while working on the proofs of volume II; the work was completed by friends and former pupils of Edmonds, under the direction of Alison Duke. And Edmonds' manuscript for volume III was left in such good shape that its publication in due time is assured. It is a fitting tribute to Mr. Edmonds, who devoted a long life to classical scholarship, that this monumental work should now appear, as a capstone to his career.

The second volume is in the same format and contains the same indices, lists, and other aids as volume I, for a description of which readers are referred to my review in *A. J. P.*, LXXX, 1 (Jan. 1959), pp. 95-8. This volume, therefore, has the same merits and suffers from some of the same drawbacks there mentioned, which need not be repeated here. A few points may be amplified.

The English versions continue to be far from helpful. The translations, usually in rhyming couplets, are too free, and often there are bits of British slang which throw the unwary American reader off balance: e. g., "bully" for pander (Anaxilas' *Hyacinthos Porno-*

boskos). Some of the versions are completely unintelligible (at least, to me); and others contain real mistakes: e. g., Eubulus 124, 125:

"Strange how the praises of old wine are sung
By ladies gay, while men prefer it young"

(Edmonds, p. 141).

The Greek plainly means that *hetairai* prefer their wine old and their men young. Epierates 11, the famous and witty description of an exercise in definition at Plato's Academy, is especially disappointing: on the strength of two or three Doric alphas in the 39 lines of text, the whole passage is rendered in broad Scotch dialect. I wonder how many of my colleagues would agree that it is time to put an end to this cute trick of rendering the Greek dialects in the almost unintelligible dialects of the British Isles.

The notes are filled with tentative suggestions for the nature of the missing plots or subjects of the plays. Edmonds was particularly prone to find political subjects or allusions, even in the most unlikely titles. Now, it is true that Middle Comedy did not give up Comedy's concern with politics, as Webster has demonstrated; but this hardly justifies finding references to Alexander and Jason, tyrants of Pherae in the fourth century, in almost any mythological title related to Thessaly or Pherae. Further, these far-fetched guesses are often used to date the play; and the list of dated or conjecturally datable plays in the appendix is filled with these bold conjectures. Any student using this appendix for a chronology of Middle Comedy should be warned that it is filled with unreliable items.

The critical apparatus is inadequate for scholarly uses. Although Edmonds gives in his apparatus any manuscript readings that differ from the printed text above, he often fails to inform us whether the emendation is his own or from earlier sources. Hence, it is constantly necessary to consult Kock and Meineke to discover which readings are new.

Finally, there are still too many misprints, in both the English and the Greek text.

Despite these rather serious flaws, the work has real value: Kock and Meineke have long been out of print, and are now almost unobtainable. Edmonds spent years of patient and (I suspect) dull toil to provide us with a new and usable edition; used with care and caution it may well serve the needs of this generation and the next. For this we should be properly grateful.

CHARLES T. MURPHY.

OBERLIN COLLEGE.

JACQUES ANDRÉ. Notes de lexicographie botanique grecque. Paris, Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1958. Pp. 76. (*Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences historiques et philologiques*, fasc. 311.)

The author of this study is already well known, not only for his larger work on Latin words for colors, but also for his *Lexiques des termes de botanique en Latin* (1956), which was reviewed by me in *A. J. P.*, LXXIX (1958), pp. 102-3, and for various shorter studies.

In the course of his work on Latin botanical terms he was surprised to find how many were of Greek origin, and in the present work he similarly finds reason to stress the number of Greek plants whose names betray an Egyptian provenience, such as "Heart of Bubastis" and "Blood of Ammon."

For the convenience of the reader it would be well if André had included in a single catalogue all the Greek terms found in Latin writers, but he has deliberately refrained from repeating information already to be had in Liddell-Scott-Jones. From slag rejected by them, from Greek words of the fourth to the sixth century, and in various works on medicine, miscellaneous glosses, as well as from authors like Columella, Pliny the Elder (inadequately exploited hitherto), and Isidore, the author collects his specimens. He enjoys a great advantage over American students in the same field from being familiar at first hand—or first hand backed by the monumental *Flora Orientalis* of Edmond Boissier—with a considerable part of at least the more conspicuous and generally known species of the Mediterranean flora, and by means of nomenclature and of uses persisting to the present day as well as by ancient definitions and synonyms he can identify with some plausibility many plants mentioned by ancient authors. At times a user of the book would welcome more evidence for species rather blithely named, but he must recognize that there are frontiers where time-consuming collections and ingenious combinations are required to achieve even approximate results. Yet we must recognize that further steps are needed. As indicated in my review of the former volume, there is now demanded a courageous ransacking of the entire Greco-Latin literature down through Isidore, including such sources as Hesychius, Orion, the *Etymologicum Magnum* and *Etymologicum Gudianum*, the Homeric and other important scholia, the commentators on Aristotle, and the Church Fathers—a glance at Hier., *In Ionam*, 4, 6, and related passages in Jerome and Augustine will show the need of much dredging in unpromising waters. I suspect that Galen will furnish more not yet used, and an ambitious worker will probably want to consider archaeological materials in which plants like silphium appear on coins or carvings. In short, to the very valuable collections of André additional gleanings are both possible and needed, envisaging the creation of one Greco-Latin botanical lexicon.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all pertaining to the classical field are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Bennett (Emmett L.), Chadwick (John), Ventris (Michael). The Knossos Tablets—A Transliteration. Second Edition with Corrections and Additions by John Chadwick with the assistance of Fred Householder. *University of London, Institute of Classical Studies*, 1959. Pp. vi + 137. 15 s. (*Bulletin Supplement No. 7.*)

Bérard (Jean). L'expansion et la colonisation grecques jusqu'aux guerres Médiques. Paris, Aubier, *Éditions Montaigne*, 1960. Pp. 178.

Boak (Arthur E.) and Youtie (Herbert Chayyim). The Archive of Aurelius Isidorus in the Egyptian Museum, Cairo, and the University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, *Univ. of Michigan Press*, 1960. Pp. xix + 478; 7 pls.

Burguière (Paul). Histoire de l'infinitif en Grec. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1960. Pp. 236. (*Études et Commentaires*, XXXIII.)

Dahlmann (Hellfried) and Merkelbach (Reinhold). Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik. Köln, Opladen, *Westdeutscher Verlag*, 1959. Pp. 307. DM 39.

Dodds (E. R.). Euripides, *Bacchae*. Edited with Introduction and Commentary. Second Edition. Oxford, *Clarendon Press*, 1960. Pp. lix + 253. \$3.40.

Dumbarton Oaks Papers, Number Thirteen. Edited by the Committee on Publications, The Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, Trustees for Harvard University. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1959. Pp. 273; illus. \$10.00.

Fuhrmann (Manfred). Das systematische Lehrbuch. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*, 1960. Pp. 192.

Gagnepain (Jean). Les noms grecs en -os et en -a. Contribution à l'étude du genre en Indo-Européen. Paris, *Librairie C. Klincksieck*, 1959. Pp. 104. (*Études et Commentaires*, XXXI.)

Gauthier (René Antoine) and Jolif (Jean Yves). L'Éthique à Nicomaque. Tome I: Introduction, traduction et commentaire. Tome II: Commentaire, deuxième partie, Livres VI-X. Louvain, *Publications Universitaires*, 1958 and 1959.

Helmbold (William C.) and O'Neil (Edward N.). Plutarch's Quotations. *American Philological Association*, 1959. Pp. xiii + 76. (*Philological Monographs*, XIX.)

Huxley (G. L.). Anthemius of Tralles. A Study in Later Greek Geometry. Cambridge, Mass., *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 1959. Pp. vii + 62. (*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs*, I.)

Jalabert (Louis) and Mousterde (René). Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie, Tome V: Émésène. Paris, *Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner*, 1959. Pp. 340. (*Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth, Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique*, LXVI.)

Kirschbaum (Engelbert, S. J.). The Tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul. Translated from the German by John Murray, S. J. New York, *St. Martin's Press*, 1959. Pp. 247; 4 color pls.; 40 monochrome pls.; 57 figs.; 2 maps. \$7.50.

Koppers (B. Th.). Negative Conditional Sentences in Greek and Some Other Indo-European Languages. The Hague, N. V. *Drij. Pier Westerbaan*, 1959. Pp. 133.